THE CASE OF Resistance OF THE SUPREME POWERS Stated and Resolved,

According to the

DOCTRINE OF THE Holy Scriptures.

By *WILL. SHERLOCK*, D.D.
Rector of St. *George Buttolph-lane, London.*

LONDON: Printed for *Fincham Gardiner*, at the *White-horse* in *Ludgate-street*. 1684.

THE

CASE

OF

Relief

OF THE

SUNKEN FOWERS

And Resolved.

321.7
Sh.54c

TO THE

Right Honourable

FRANCIS

Lord *GUILFORD*,

Lord Keeper of the

Great Seal of *ENGLAND*,

and one of

His Majesties most Honourable

PRIVY COUNCIL.

My Lord,

I *Humbly beg leave to present to your Lordships hands, a very plain Discourse, but very necessary in such an*

947304

Age as this, wherein the principles of Rebellion are openly profest and taught, and the Doctrine of Non-reſiſtance and Paſſive Obedience, not confuted, but laught out of countenance.

There have been indeed a great many excellent Books writ upon this Argument by learned men; but I fear moſt of them are too learned for ordinary Readers, who moſt need inſtruction, and are moſt eaſily poiſoned with Seditious Doctrines; and therefore there is ſtill occaſion enough for ſuch a ſmall Treatiſe as this, which I hope is fitted to the underſtanding of the meaneſt men, who will be ſo honeſt, as impartially to conſider it: and thoſe who will not read nor conſider, what is offered for their conviction, are out of the

reach

reach of all inſtruction, and muſt be governed by other methods.

My Lord,

Your Lordſhips known Loyalty and Zeal for the ſervice of the Crown, which by the favour of a wiſe and diſcerning Prince has deſervedly advanced you to ſo high a Station, made me preſume, that ſuch a preſent as this, though in it ſelf very mean, might not be unacceptable to you, eſpecially when it is intended as a publick acknowledgment (the beſt which my mean circumſtances in the World enable me to make) of thoſe great favours I have received from your Lordſhip.

That God would bleſs your Lordſhip with a long Life, and vigorous Age, and encreaſe of Ho-

nour,

nour, for the ſervice of the King, and of the Church, is the prayer of,

My Lord,

Your Lordſhips
moſt humble and
moſt obedient Servant,

W. SHERLOCK.

The

THE CASE OF Resistance OF THE SUPREME POWERS

Stated and Resolved,

According to the Doctrine of the Holy SCRIPTURES.

The INTRODUCTION.

I Presume, I need make no apologie for the seasonableness of this Discourse at this time: for if ever it be fit to put People in mind of that Subjection which they owe to the Higher Powers, no time can be more proper for it, than when we see the Peace and Security of

Publick Government disturbed and endangered by *Popish* and *Fanatick Conspiracies*, who like *Sampson's Foxes*, though they look very different ways, yet are tyed together by the *Tail* with a *Firebrand* between them; and had not the good Providence of God wonderfully appeared for the preservation of his *Anointed*, I am sure it had been a very unseasonable time now to have treated on this Subject: and therefore, setting aside all *Apologies*, I shall onely give a brief account of the designe of this following *Treatise*.

There are three ways of proving and confirming the *Doctrine* of *Non-resistance*, or *Subjection* to *Soveraign Princes*. 1. By the *Testimonies* of the *Holy Scriptures*. 2. By the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Christians. 3. By the fundamental Constitutions of that particular Government under which we live. I have considered the last, as much as was necessary to my purpose. The second I have not meddled with: for whoever has a mind to be satisfied about it, may consult that admirable Discourse of *Archbishop Usher*, about the Power of the *Prince*, and the Obedience of the *Subject*; which will not cost much money, nor take

take up much time to read it. But the deſigne I propoſed to my ſelf, was carefully to conſider the Teſtimonies of Scripture, which are beyond all other Authorities, and to vindicate them from the Cavils and Exceptions of the ſeveral Patrons of *Reſiſtance*. And the whole Diſcourſe is divided into theſe following Chapters.

1. The Firſt contains the Authorities of the *Old Teſtament*; wherein I have plainly ſhewn, that *God* himſelf ſet up a Soveraign and Irreſiſtible Power in the *Jewiſh Nation*; and that during all that time, it was unlawful for *Subjects*, upon any pretence whatſoever, to reſiſt *their Princes*.

2. The Second contains the Doctrine of our *Saviour*, concerning Subjection to *Soveraign Princes*.

3. The Third contains an account of our *Saviour*'s Example in this matter.

4. The Fourth conſiders what Saint *Paul*'s Doctrine was about Subjection.

5. The Fifth, the Doctrine of Saint *Peter*.

6. The Sixth contains an Anſwer to the moſt popular Objections againſt *Non-reſiſtance*.

In examining the Authorities of *Scripture*,

pture, I have carefully conſidered whatever has been plauſibly urged in defence of the *Doctrine* of *Reſiſtance*, and reduced it under thoſe particular *Texts* which have been thought moſt to favour it: and I do not know of any thing material, which has been pleaded in this Cauſe, which I have wholly omitted. Poſſibly ſome may complain, that I have not obſerved the exact *Rules* of *Art* and *Method* in this, to propoſe the *Queſtion*, to explain the *Terms* of it, to produce my *Proofs*, and then to anſwer the *Objections* which are made againſt it. Now this I muſt acknowledge in part to be true; and I think this *Diſcourſe* never the leſs perfect for that. The Propoſition I undertake to prove, is this: That *Soveraign Princes*, or the *Supreme Power* in any Nation, in whomſoever it is plac'd, is in all caſes irreſiſtible. This is a plain Propoſition, which needs no explanation: and the way I take to prove it, is as plain; by producing the *Teſtimonies* of *Scripture* both of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, as they lie in order, and ſhewing what *Power* they grant to *Princes*, and what *Obedience* they require of *Subjects*. This is the faireſt way I could think on, to give my *Readers* a full view

of

of the *Doctrine* of the *Scriptures* in this matter; and this was all I intended to do: for I am verily perſwaded, that were men once convinced that *Reſiſtance* of *Princes* is expreſly contrary to the *Doctrine* both of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, it would be no eaſie matter, by any other Arts or Pretences, to draw the moſt fanatical and factious perſons amongſt us (who retain any Reverence for God) into a Rebellion.

CHAP. I.

Wherein the Unlawfulneſs of Reſiſting the Supreme Powers is proved, from the Authority of the Old Teſtament.

TO prove the unlawfulneſs of *Reſiſtance*, I ſhall begin with the Old Teſtament. Now there is nothing more evident, than that God ſet up ſuch a Supreme and Soveraign Power in the *Jewiſh Nation*, as could not, and ought not to be reſiſted by the Fundamental Laws of their Government. For this is all I am concerned at preſent to prove, That it is never lawful to reſiſt the *Higher Powers*; not that the Supreme and Soveraign power is always to be *in a ſingle Perſon*, but that wherever it is, it is irreſiſtible, and that whenever this Supreme power by the *Laws* of the *Nation*, is inveſted in a *ſingle Perſon*, ſuch a Prince muſt not upon any pretence whatſoever be reſiſted.

The firſt Governour God ſet over the Chil-

Children of *Iſrael*, when he brought them out of the Land of *Egypt*, was *Moſes*; and I think I need not prove how Sacred and irreſiſtible his Authority was. This is ſufficiently evident in the rebellion of *Korah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, againſt *Moſes* and *Aaron*, when God cauſed the earth to open her mouth and ſwallow them up, 16 *Numbers*. And leſt this ſhould be thought an extraordinary caſe, *Moſes* and *Aaron* being extraordinary perſons, immediately appointed by God, and governed by his immediate direction; the Apoſtle St. *Jude* alleadges this example againſt thoſe in his days, who were turbulent and factious, *who deſpiſed dominions, and ſpake evil of dignities, that they ſhould periſh in the gainſaying of Core*, *Jud. v.* 11. which he could not have done, had not this example extended to all ordinary, as well as extraordinary Caſes; had it not been a laſting teſtimony of Gods diſpleaſure againſt all thoſe, who oppoſe themſelves againſt the *Soveraign powers*. But *Moſes* was not always to rule over them, and therefore God expreſly provides for a Succeſſion of *Soveraign power*, to which they muſt all ſubmit. The *ordinary Sovereign* power of the *Jewiſh*

Nation after *Moses* his death, was devolved either on the *high Priest*, or those extraordinary persons whom God was pleased to raise up, such as *Joshua* and the several *Judges*, till in *Samuels* days it setled in their *Kings*. For as for the *Jewish Sanhedrim*, whose power is so much extolled by the *Jewish Writers*, who are all of a late date, many years since the destruction of *Jerusalem*, and therefore no competent *witnesses* of what was done so many ages before, it does not appear from any testimony of Scripture, that there was any such *Court* of *Judicature*, till after their return from the *Babylonish Captivity*.

But yet God took care to secure the Peace and good Government of the Nation, by appointing such a power as should receive the last *Appeals*, and whose *Sentence* in all *Controversies* should be final, and uncontroulable, as you may see in the 17 *Deut.* 8,9, 10,11, 12 *v.* There were inferiour Magistrates and *Judges* appointed in their several Tribes and Cities, which *Moses* did by the advice of *Jethro* his Father-in-law, and by the approbation of God, *Exod.* 18. But as the Supreme Power was still reserved in the hands of *Moses*, while he

he lived, ſo it is here ſecured to the *high Prieſt*, or *Judges*, after his death; for it is expreſly appointed, that if thoſe inferiour *Judges* could not determine the Controverſie, they ſhould come unto the *Prieſts*, *the Levites*, that is, the Prieſts of the *Tribe* of *Levi*, (who by the 12 *ver.* appears only to be the *High Prieſt*) *and to the Judge that ſhall be in thoſe days*, that is, if it ſhall be at ſuch a time, when there is an extraordinary Judge raiſed by God, (for there were not always ſuch *Judges* in *Iſrael*, as is evident to any one who reads the Book of *Judges*) and of them they ſhould *inquire*, *and they ſhall ſhew the ſentence of Judgment*; and *thou ſhalt do according to the Sentence which they of that place*, (*which the Lord ſhall chooſe*) *ſhall ſhew thee*, *and thou ſhalt obſerve to do according to all they ſhall inform thee.* Where the Place which God ſhall chooſe, ſignifies the Place which he ſhould appoint for the *Ark* of the *Covenant*, and for the *Levitical worſhip*; which was the place where the *high Prieſt*, and the *chief Judge* or Ruler of *Iſrael*, when there was any ſuch perſon, had their ordinary reſidence; which was at firſt at *Shilo*, and afterwards at *Jeruſalem*.

And

And what the Authority of the *chief Prieſt*, or of the *Judge* when there was one, was in thoſe days, appears from *v.* 12. *And the man that will do preſumptuouſly, and will not hearken to the Prieſt*, (*that ſtandeth to miniſter there before the Lord thy God*) *or unto the Judge, even that man ſhall die, and thou ſhalt put away the evil from Iſrael.* This is as abſolute Authority, as the moſt abſolute *Monarch* in the world can challenge, that diſobedience to their laſt and final determination, what ever the cauſe be, ſhall be puniſht with death: and what place can there be for *Reſiſtance* in ſuch a Conſtitution of Government as this? It is ſaid indeed in *v.* 11. according *to the ſentence of the Law, which they ſhall teach thee, and according to the judgment that they ſhall tell thee, thou ſhalt do.* And hence ſome conclude, that they were not bound to abide by their ſentence, nor were puniſhable, if they did not, but onely in ſuch caſes, when they gave ſentence according to the Law of God. But theſe men do not conſider that the matter in controverſie is ſuppoſed to be doubtful, and ſuch as could not be determined by the *inferiour Courts*, and therefore is ſubmit-

ted

ted to the deciſion of the *Supreme Judge*; and as he determined, ſo they muſt do; and no man, under the penalty of death, muſt preſume to do otherwiſe: which takes away all liberty of judging from private perſons, though this *Supreme Judge* might poſſibly miſtake in his Judgment, as all *humane Judicatures* are liable to miſtakes; but it ſeems God Almighty thought it neceſſary that there ſhould be ſome final Judgment, from whence there ſhould be no *appeal*, notwithſtanding the poſſibility of a miſtake in it.

So that there was a *Supreme* and *Soveraign*, that is, unaccountable and irreſiſtible Power in the *Jewiſh Nation* appointed by God himſelf: for indeed it is not poſſible that the publick Peace and Security of any *Nation* ſhould be preſerved without it. And I think it is as plain, that when the *Jews* would have a *King*, their *Kings* were inveſted with this *Supreme* and *Irreſiſtible Power*: for when they deſired a *King*, they did not deſire a meer *nominal* and *titular King*, but a *King to judge them*, and *to go out before them, and fight their battels*; that is, a *King* who had the Supreme and Soveraign Authority, 1 *Sam.* 8. 6. 19. 20.

a *King* who should have all that power of Government, excepting the peculiar acts of the Priestly Office, which either their *High-Priest* or their *Judges* had before.

And therefore when *Samuel* tells them what shall be the *manner* of their *King*, 11 *ver.* though what he says does necessarily suppose the translation of the Soveraign and Irresistible power to the person of their *King*, yet it does not suppose that the *King* had any new power given him more than what was exercised formerly by their *Priests* and *Judges*. He does not deter them from chusing a *King*, because a *King* should have greater power, and be more uncontroulable and irresistible than their other *Rulers* were: for *Samuel* himself had had as soveraign and irresistible a power as any King, being the Supreme Judge in *Israel*, whose Sentence no man could disobey or contradict, but he incurred the penalty of death, according to the Mosaical Law. But the reason why he dissuades them from chusing a *King*, was because the external *Pomp* and *Magnificence* of *Kings* was like to be very chargeable and oppressive to them. *He will take your sons and appoint them for himself,*

himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen, and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties, and will set them to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest. And thus in several particulars he acquaints them what burdens and exactions they will bring upon themselves by setting up a *King*, which they were then free from: and if any *Prince* should be excessive in such exactions, yet they had no way to help themselves; they must not resist nor rebel against him, nor expect, that what inconvenience they might find in *Kingly Government*, God would relieve and deliver them from it, when once they had chose a *King*: *Ye shall try out in that day, because of your King which ye have chosen you, and the Lord will not hear you in that day*, v. 18. That is, God will not alter the *government* for you again, how much soever you may complain of it.

This, I say, is a plain proof that their *Kings* were invested with that Soveraign Power which must not be resisted, though they oppress their Subjects to maintain their own State, and the Grandeur and Magnificence of their Kingdom.

dom. But I cannot think, that theſe words contain the *original grant* and Charter of Regal power, but only the tranſlation of that power which was formerly in their *high-Prieſts* or *Judges to Kings*. *Kings* had no more power than their other Governours had: for there can be no power greater than that which is irreſiſtible; but this power in the hands of *Kings* was likely to be more burdenſome and oppreſſive to them, than it was in the hands of their *Prieſts* and *Judges*, by reaſon of their different way of living; which is the onely argument *Samuel* uſes to diſſuade them from transferring the *Supreme* and *Soveraign power* to *Princes*. And therefore I rather chooſe to Tranſlate *Miſhpat*, as our Tranſlators do, *by the manner of the King*, than as other learned men do, *by the right of the King*, thereby underſtanding the original Charter of Kingly power: for it is not the Regal power which *Samuel* here blames, which is no other but the very ſame power which he himſelf had, while he was Supreme *Judge* of *Iſrael*, but their pompous way of living, which would prove very oppreſſive and burdenſome to them, and be apt to make them complain, who had not been uſed to ſuch exactions. And

And here before I proceed, give me leave to make a ſhort digreſſion in vindication of *Kingly Government*, which ſome men think is greatly diſparaged by this ſtory. For 1. It is evident that God was angry with the *Jews* for deſiring a *King*; and declared his anger againſt them, by ſending a violent tempeſt of Thunder and Rain in Wheat-harveſt; which made them confeſs, *that they had added to all their ſins this evil, to ask a King*, 1 *Sam.* 12. 16, 17. *&c.* From whence ſome conclude, that Kingly power and Authority is ſo far from being the Original appointment and conſtitution of God, that it is diſpleaſing to him. And 2. that *Samuel* in deſcribing *the manner of the King*, repreſents it as oppreſſive and uneaſie to Subjects, and much more burdenſome, and leſs deſirable than other Forms of Government.

1. As for the firſt, it muſt be acknowledged, that God was angry with the *Children of Iſrael* for asking a *King*: but then theſe men miſtake the reaſon, which was not becauſe God is an enemy to *Kingly Government*, but becauſe he himſelf was the *King of Iſrael*; and by asking a *King* to go in and out before them, they expreſt a diſlike of *Gods Govern-*

ment

ment of them. Thus God tells *Samuel*, *They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them*, 1 *Sam.* 8. 7. And thus *Samuel* aggravates their sin, *that they said, Nay but a King shall reign over us; when the Lord your God was your King*, 12 *Chap.* 12 *v.*

Now the Crime had been the same, had they set up an *Aristocratical* or *Democratical* Government, as well as *Regal* Power, in derogation of Gods Government of them. Their fault was not in chooſing to be governed by a ſingle perſon; for ſo they had been governed all along, by *Moſes* and *Joſhua*, by their *high Prieſts*, or thoſe other extraordinary *Judges* whom God had raiſed up, and at this very time by *Samuel* himſelf: for it is a great miſtake to think that the Jews, before they choſe a *King*, were governed by a *Synedrial power*, like an *Ariſtocracy* or *Democracy*, which there is not the leaſt appearance of in all the *Sacred Hiſtory*; for as for thoſe perſons whom *Moſes* by the advice of *Jethro* ſet over the people, they were not a ſupreme or *Soveraign Tribunal*, but ſuch *Subordinate Magiſtrates* as every *Prince* makes uſe of for adminiſtring Juſtice to

the

the People. *They were Rulers of thouſands, Rulers of hundreds, Rulers of fifties, Rulers of tens,* 18 *Exod.* 21. and were ſo far from being one ſtanding Judicature, that they were divided among their ſeveral Tribes and Families; and were ſo far from being ſupreme, that *Moſes* ſtill reſerved all difficult caſes, and laſt appeals, that is, the true Soveraign power to himſelf, as it was afterwards by an expreſs Law reſerved to the *High Prieſts*, and *Judges* extraordinarily appointed: and there is ſo little appearance of this Soveraign Tribunal in *Samuels* days, that he himſelf went in Circuit every year, as our Judges now do, to *Bethel* and *Gilgal*, and *Mizpeh*, and *judged Iſrael*, 1 *Sam.*7.16.

But the fault of *Iſrael* in asking a *King* was this, that they preferred the government of a King, before the immediate government of God. For the underſtanding of which, it will be neceſſary to conſider briefly, how Gods government of *Iſrael* differ'd from their government by *Kings*. For when they had choſe a *King*, did God ceaſe to be the King of *Iſrael*? was not their King Gods Miniſter and Vicegerent, as their Rulers and Judges were before? was

not the King God's Anointed? and did he not receive the Laws and Rules of Government from him? yes, this is in ſome meaſure true, and yet the difference is very great.

While God was the King of *Iſrael*, though he appointed a Supreme viſible Authority in the Nation, yet the exerciſe of this Authority was under the immediate direction and government of God. *Moſes* and *Joſhua* did not ſtir a ſtep, nor attempt any thing without Gods order, no more than a menial ſervant does without the direction of his Maſter. In times of Peace, they were under the ordinary government of the *High Prieſt*, who was God's immediate ſervant, who declared the Law to them, and in difficult caſes, referred the cauſe to God, who gave forth his anſwers by him: when they were oppreſt by their enemies, which God never permitted, but for their ſins, when they repented and begged Gods pardon and deliverance, God raiſed up ſome *extraordinary perſons* endued with an extraordinary ſpirit, to fight their Battels for them, and ſubdue their Enemies, and to judge *Iſrael*; and theſe men did every thing by a Divine impulſe and inſpiration, as *Moſes* and

and *Joſhua* did. So that they were as immediately governed by God, as any man governs his own houſe and Family. But when the Government was put into the hands of *Kings*, God in a great meaſure left the adminiſtration of it to the will and pleaſure of *Princes*, and to the methods of humane Governments and Policy.

Though God did immediately appoint *Saul*, and afterwards *David* to be King, yet ordinarily the government deſcended not by God's immediate choice, but by the *right* of *Succeſſion*: and though ſome Kings were Prophets too, yet it was not often ſo; they were not ſo immediately directed by God as the *Judges* of old were, but had their Councels of State for advice in peace and war, and their ſtanding Armies and Guards for the defence of their Perſons and Government. They were indeed commanded to govern by the Laws of *Moſes*, to conſult the Oracles of God in difficult caſes, and God raiſed up extraordinary Prophets to direct them, but ſtill it was in their own power, whether they would obey the Laws of God, or hearken to his Prophets; good Kings did, and bad Kings did not; and there-

fore the government of *Israel* by Kings, was like other humane governments, lyable to all the defects and miscarriages which other governments are; whereas while the government was immediately in God's hands, they did not only receive their *Laws*, and external *Polity* from him, but the very executive power was in God: for though it was administred by Men, yet it was administred by God's immediate direction, with the most exact Wisdom, Justice and Goodness.

This was the sin of the *Jews*, that they preferred the Government of an earthly King, before having God for their King; and this must be acknowledged to be a great fault, but it is such a fault, as no other Nation was ever capable of, but only the *Jews*, because God never vouchsafed to be *King* of any other Nation in such a manner; and therefore we must not compare Kingly government, for there is no competition between them, with the Government of God, but we must compare Kingly government with any other form of humane Government; and then we have reason to believe, that notwithstanding God was angry with the *Jews*, and this was a case peculiar to the *Jews* for desiring

ring a *King*, that yet he prefers Kingly government before any other, becauſe when he foreſaw that the *Jews* would in time grow weary of his government, he makes proviſion in their Law, for ſetting up a King, not for ſetting up an *Ariſtocratical* or *Democratical* power, which their Law makes no allowance for, as you may ſee, 17 *Deuter.* 14.

2. Another objection againſt Kingly power and Government, is, that *Samuel* in this place repreſents it as very oppreſſive and burdenſome to the Subject. For what ſome men anſwer, that *Samuel* ſpeaks here only of the abuſe of *Regal* Power, I think is not true; for the meer abuſe of power is no Argument againſt it, becauſe all kind and forms of power are lyable to be abuſed, and by this reaſon we ſhould have no government at all. And it is evident, that *Samuel* does not mention any one thing here, that can be called an abuſe of power, nothing but what is abſolutely neceſſary to maintain the State and Magnificence of an *Imperial Crown*. For how can a Prince ſubſiſt without Officers and Servants of all ſorts, both Men and Women, both for the uſes of his Family, and the ſervice of his government both

in Peace and War? and how can this be maintained, but by a Revenue proportionable to the expence? and ſince none of them had ſuch an eſtate, as to defray this charge themſelves, whoever was to be choſen King, muſt have it from others, by publick Grants and publick Taxes, which he here expreſſes by *taking their fields and their vineyards, and their olive-yards, the tenth of their fields, and their vineyards, and the tenth of their ſheep, for himſelf and his ſervants,* the tenth being the uſual Tribute paid to the *Eaſtern Kings.* This is not an abuſe of power, though ſome *Princes* might be exceſſive in all this, but it is *the manner of the King*, that which is neceſſary to his Royal State. There is nothing of all this forbid in 17 *Deuter.* where God gives Laws to the *King*; and indeed to forbid this, would be to forbid Kingly power, which cannot ſubſiſt without it.

Indeed I find ſome Learned men miſtaken in this matter; for they take it for granted, that what *Samuel* here calls *the manner of the King*, is ſuch an abuſe of power, as God had expreſly forbid to Kings in the 17 of *Deuter.* 16, 17. but why the abuſe of Regal power ſhould be

be called *the manner* or *the right* of the King, is paſt my underſtanding. *Miſhpat*, however you Tranſlate it, muſt ſignifie ſomething which is eſſential to Kingly government, otherwiſe *Samuels* Argument againſt chuſing a *King* had been ſophiſtical and fallacious. For there is no Form of Government but is lyable to great abuſes, when it falls into ill hands: and this they had experience of at this very time; for the miſcarriages of *Samuel's Sons*, was the great reaſon, why the people at this time deſired a King, 1 *Sam.* 8. 3, 4, 5. And if we compare theſe two places together, what God forbids the King, with what *Samuel* calls *the manner of the King*, we ſhall find nothing alike. In the 17 of *Deut.* 16, 17. *v.* God tells them, that their King *ſhall not multiply horſes to himſelf, nor cauſe the people to return into Egypt, to the end that he ſhould multiply horſes, for as much as the Lord hath ſaid unto you, Ye ſhall henceforth return no more that way.* God would not allow them to have any Commerce or intercourſe with *Egypt*, and therefore forbid their *Kings* to multiply horſes, with which *Egypt* did abound, that there might be no new familiarity contracted with that

Idolatrous Nation. Neither ſhall he *multiply wives to himſelf, that his heart turn not away.* Where *multiplying wives* ſeems plainly to refer to his taking wives of other Nations and other Religions, as appears from what is added, *that his heart turn not away:* that is, leſt they ſhould ſeduce him to *Idolatry*, as we know *Solomon*'s wives did him, who are therefore ſaid to *turn away his heart*, 1 *Kings* 11. 3, 4. *Neither ſhall he greatly multiply to himſelf ſilver and gold.* For ſuch a covetous humour would mightily tempt him to oppreſs his Subjects. This is all that God expreſly forbids their Kings, when they ſhould have any. But now *Samuel* in deſcribing *the manner of the King*, takes no notice of any thing of all this, but only tells them, that their *King* would appoint out fit perſons for his ſervice of their Sons and Daughters, that they ſhould pay *Tribute* to him, and ſhould themſelves be his *ſervants*; not as ſervants ſignifies ſlaves and vaſſals, but Subjects, who owe all duty and ſervice to their Prince as far as he needs them.

But what is it then that *Samuel* finds fault with in *Kingly power*, & which he uſes as an argument to diſſuade the Children

dren of *Iſrael* from deſiring a King? why it is no more, than the neceſſary expences and ſervices of *Kingly power*, which would be thought very grievous to them, who were a free people, and at that time ſubject to no publick ſervices and exactions. The government they then lived under was no charge at all to them They were governed, as I obſerved before, either by their *High Prieſt*, or by *Judges* extraordinarily raiſed by God. As for their *High Prieſts*, God himſelf had allotted their maintenance ſutable to the quality and dignity of their Office; and therefore they were no more charge to the people when they were their Supreme Governors, than they were, when the power was in other hands, either in the hands of *Judges* or *Kings*. As for their *Judges* whom God raiſed up, they affected nothing of Royal greatneſs, they had no Servants or Retinue, ſtanding Guards or Armies to maintain their Authority, which was ſecured by that Divine power with which they acted, not by the external pomp and ſplendour of a Court. Thus we find *Moſes* appealing to God in the Rebellion of *Korah*, *I have not taken one Aſs from them, neither have I hurt any of them,*

them, 16 *Numbers* 15. And thus *Samuel* appeals to the Children of *Iſrael* themſelves, *Behold, here I am, witneſs againſt me before the Lord, and before his Anointed; whoſe Oxe have I taken? or whoſe Aſs have I taken? or whom have I defrauded? whom have I oppreſſed? or of whoſe hands have I received any bribe to blind mine eyes therewith? and I will reſtore it*, 1 *Sam.* 12. 3. Now a people, who lived ſo free from all Tributes, exactions, and other ſervices due to Princes, muſt needs be thought ſick of eaſe and liberty, to exchange ſo cheap, ſo free a State, for the neceſſary burdens and expences of Royal power, though it were no more than what is neceſſary; which is the whole of *Samuels* argument, not that Kingly government is more expenſive and burdenſome than any other form of humane government, but that it was to bring a new burden upon themſelves, when they had none before. No humane Governments, whether *Democracies* or *Ariſtocracies*, can ſubſiſt, but upon the publick charge; and the neceſſary expences of *Kingly power* are not greater than of a *Commonwealth*. Iam ſure this *Kingdom* did not find their burdens eaſed by pulling down their *King*; and

I believe, whoever acquaints himſelf with the ſeveral forms of government, will find *Kingly Power* to be as eaſie upon this ſcore, as Commonwealths. So that what *Samuel* diſcourſes here, and which ſome men think ſo great a reflection upon *Kingly government*, does not at all concern us, but was peculiar to the ſtate and condition of the *Jews* at that time.

Let us then proceed to conſider how ſacred and irreſiſtible the Perſons and Authority of *Kings* were under the *Jewiſh Government*; and there cannot be a plainer example of this, than in the caſe of *David*. He was himſelf anointed to be *King after Saul's* death, but in the mean time was grievouſly perſecuted by *Saul*, purſued from one place to another, with a deſigne to take away his life. How now does *David* behave himſelf in this extremity? What courſe does he take to ſecure himſelf from *Saul?* Why he takes the onely courſe that is left a Subject; he flies for it, and hides himſelf from *Saul* in the Mountains and Caves of the Wilderneſs; and when he found he was diſcovered in one place, he removes to another: He kept Spies upon *Saul* to obſerve his motions,

not

not that he might meet him to give him Battel, or to take him at an advantage; but that he might keep out of his way, and not fall unawares into his hands.

Well, but this was no thanks to *David*, becauſe he could do no otherwiſe. He was too weak for *Saul*, and not able to ſtand againſt him; and therefore had no other remedy but flight. But yet we muſt conſider, that *David* was a man of War, he ſlew *Goliah*, and fought the Battels of *Iſrael* with great ſucceſs; he was an admired and beloved Captain, which made *Saul* ſo jealous of him; the eyes of *Iſrael* were upon him for their next King, and how eaſily might he have raiſed a potent and formidable Rebellion againſt *Saul!* But he was ſo far from this, that he invites no man to his aſſiſtance; and when ſome came uninvited, he made no uſe of them in an offenſive or defenſive War againſt *Saul*. Nay, when God delivered *Saul* two ſeveral times into *David*'s hands, that he could as eaſily have killed him, as have *cut off the skirts of his garment at Engedi*, 1 Sam. 24. or as have taken that *ſpear away which ſtuck in the ground at his bolſter, as he did in the hill of Hachilah*, 1 *Sam.* 26. yet he would neither touch

Saul

Saul himſelf, nor ſuffer any of the people that were with him to do it, though they were very importunate with him for liberty to kill *Saul*; nay, though they urged him with an argument from Providence, that it was a plain evidence that it was the Will of God that he ſhould kill *Saul*, becauſe God had now delivered his enemy into his hands, according to the promiſe he had made to *David*, 1 *Sam.* 24. 4. 26 *ch. ver.* 8. We know what uſe ſome men have made of this argument of Providence, to juſtifie all the *Villanies* they had a mind to act: but *David*, it ſeems, did not think that an opportunity of doing evil, gave him licenſe and authority to do it. Opportunity, we ſay, makes a *Thief*, and it makes a *Rebel*, and it makes a *Murderer:* no man can do any Wickedneſs, which he has no opportunity of doing; and if the Providence of God, which puts ſuch opportunities into mens hands, juſtifies the wickedneſs they commit, no man can be chargeable with any guilt whatever he does; and certainly opportunity will as ſoon juſtifie any other ſin, as Rebellion and the Murder of Princes. We are to learn our duty from the Law of God, not from his Providence;

dence; at leaſt, this muſt be a ſetled Principle, that the Providence of God will never juſtifie any action which his Law forbids.

And therefore, notwithſtanding this opportunity which God had put into his hands to deſtroy his enemy, and to take the Crown for his reward, *David* conſiders his duty, remembers, that though *Saul* were his enemy, and that very unjuſtly, yet he was the *Lords Anointed*. *The Lord forbid*, ſays he, *that I ſhould do this unto my Maſter the Lords Anointed. to ſtretch forth my hand againſt him, ſeeing he is the Lords Anointed.* Nay, he was ſo far from taking away his life, that his heart ſmote him for cutting off the skirt of his Garment. And we ought to obſerve the reaſon *David* gives, why he durſt not hurt *Saul*, Becauſe he was *the Lords Anointed*; which is the very reaſon the Apoſtle gives in the 13 *Rom.* 1, 2. *becauſe the powers are ordained of God; and he that reſiſteth the power, reſiſteth the ordinance of God.* For to be anointed of God, ſignifies no more than that he was made King by God. Thus *Joſephus* expounds being *anointed* by God, ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ βασιλείας ἀξιωθείς, one who had the Kingdom beſtowed on him by God;

God; and ὑπὸ τῦ Θεῦ κεχειροτονημένος, one who was ordained by God. For it ſeems by this phraſe, he look'd upon the external ceremony of *Anointing* to be like impoſition of hands, which in other caſes conſecrated Perſons to peculiar offices. For this external Unction was onely a viſible ſigne of Gods deſignation of them to ſuch an office; and when that was plain, they were as much *God's Anointed* without this viſible Unction as with it. *Cyrus* is called God's Anointed, though he never was anointed by any Prophet, but onely deſigned for his Kingdom by Propheſie, 45 *Iſai.* 1. And we never read in Scripture, that any *Kings* had this external Unction, who ſucceeded in the Kingdom by right of inheritance, unleſs the Title and Succeſſion were doubtful; and yet they were the Lord's Anointed too, that is, were plac'd in the Throne by him. So that this is an eternal reaſon againſt reſiſting Soveraign Princes, that they are ſet up by God, and inveſted with his authority; and therefore their Perſons and their authority are ſacred.

But yet there are ſome men, who from the example of *David*, think they can prove the lawfulneſs of a defenſive, though

though not of an offenſive War. For *David*, when he fled from *Saul*, made himſelf Captain of four hundred men, 1 *Sam.* 22. 2. which number ſoon increaſed to ſix hundred, 1 *Sam.* 23. 13. and ſtill every day increaſed by new additions, 1 *Chron.* 12. 1. Now why ſhould he entertain theſe men, but to defend himſelf againſt the forces of *Saul*? that is, to make a defenſive War whenever he was aſſaulted by him.

1. In anſwer to this, I obſerve, that *David* invited none of theſe men after him, but they came Volunteers after a Beloved Captain and General; which ſhews how formidable he could eaſily have made himſelf, when ſuch numbers reſorted to him of their own accord.

2. When he had them, he never uſed them for any hoſtile acts againſt *Saul*, or any of his forces; he never ſtood his ground, when he heard *Saul* was coming, but always fled, and his men with him; men who were never uſed to flie, and were very ready to have ſerved him againſt *Saul* himſelf, would he have permitted them. And I ſuppoſe they will not call this a defenſive War, to flie before an enemy, and to hide themſelves in Caves and Mountains;

tains; and yet this was the onely defenſive War which *David* made with all his men about him: nay, all that he would make, and all that he could make, according to his profeſſed Principles, that it *was not lawful to ſtretch out his hand againſt the Lord's Anointed.* And when theſe men are purſued, as *David* was, by an enraged and jealous Prince, we will not charge them with Rebellion, though they flie before him by thouſands in a company.

3. Yet there was ſufficient reaſon why *David* ſhould entertain theſe men, who voluntarily reſorted to him, though he never intended to uſe them againſt *Saul:* for ſome of them ſerved for ſpies to obſerve *Saul's* motions, that he might not be ſurprized by him, but have timely notice to make his eſcape. And the very preſence of ſuch a number of men about him, without any hoſtile Act, preſerved him from being ſeized on by ſome officious Perſons, who otherwiſe might have delivered him into *Saul's* hands. And he being anointed by *Samuel* to be *King* after *Saul's* death, this was the firſt ſtep to his Kingdom, to have ſuch a retinue of valiant men about him; which made his advancement to the Throne

more eaſie, and diſcouraged any oppoſitions which might otherwiſe have been made againſt him; as we ſee it proved in the event, and have reaſon to believe that it was thus ordered by God for that very end. It is certain, that *Gad* the Prophet, and *Abiathar* the Prieſt, who was the onely man who eſcaped the furie of *Saul* when he deſtroyed the Prieſts of the Lord, were in *David*'s retinue; and that *David* enterprized nothing, without firſt asking counſel of God: But he who had anointed him to be *King*, now draws forces after him, which after *Saul*'s death ſhould facilitate his advancement to the *Kingdom*.

2. It is objected further, that *David* intended to have ſtaied in *Keilah*, and to have fortified it againſt *Saul*, had not he been informed that the men of the Citie would have ſaved themſelves by delivering him up to *Saul*, 1 Sam. 23. Now to maintain any ſtrong hold againſt a *Prince*, is an act of War, though it be but a defenſive War. And I grant it is ſo, but deny that there is any appearance that *David* ever intended any ſuch thing. *David* and his men, by God's appointment and direction, had

fought

fought with the *Philiſtins*, and ſmote them with a great ſlaughter, and ſaved *Keilah* from them; and as it is probable, did intend to have ſtaied ſome time in *Keilah*. But *David* had heard that *Saul* intended to come againſt *Keilah*, to deſtroy the Citie, and take him; and enquires of the *Lord* about it, and received an anſwer, that *Saul* would come againſt the Citie. He enquires again, whether the men of *Keilah* would deliver him up to *Saul*, and was anſwered, that they would. And upon this, he and his men leave *Keilah*, and betake themſelves to the ſtrong holds in the Wilderneſs.

But now is it likely, that if *David* had had any deſigne to have fortified *Keilah* againſt *Saul*, he would have been afraid of the men of the Citie? He had 600 men with him in *Keilah*, a victorious Armie, which had lately deſtroyed the *Philiſtins* who oppreſſed them; and therefore could eaſily have kept the men of *Keilah* too in awe, if he had pleaſed, and have put it out of their power to deliver him to *Saul*. But all that *David* deſigned was, to have ſtaid there as long as he could, and, when *Saul* had drawn nigh, to have removed to ſome other

place: But when he understood the treacherous inclinations of the men of *Keilah*, and being resolved against all acts of hostilitie, he hastened his remove before *Saul* drew near. So that these men must find some other example than that of *David*, to countenance their rebellion against their *Prince:* for *David* never rebelled, never fought against *Saul*; but when he had a very potent Armie with him, he and his men always fled, and hid themselves in the Wilderness, and places of difficult access.

The sum is this: God from the very beginning, set up such a supreme and soveraign power in the *Jewish Nation*, as could not, as ought not to be resisted. This power was at first in the hands of *Moses*; and when *Korah* and his companie rebelled against him, God vindicated his authoritie by a miraculous destruction of those Rebels: *for the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up.* Afterward, when they came into *Canaan*, the ordinary exercise of this power was in their *High-Priests* and *Judges*, whom God raised up; whose sentence and judgment was final, and must not be resisted, under penaltie of death. when the Children of *Israel* desired a

King,

King, this ſoveraign and irreſiſtible power was transferred to him, and ſetled in his Perſon. *Saul* was the firſt King who was choſen by God, and anointed by *Samuel*; but for his diſobedience, was afterwards rejected by God, and *David* the ſon of *Jeſſe* was anointed *King* to ſucceed after *Saul*'s death: But in the mean time *David* was perſecuted by *Saul*, who ſought after his life. And though he himſelf was anointed by God, and *Saul* was rejected by him, yet he durſt not reſiſt nor oppoſe him, nor defend himſelf by force againſt the moſt unjuſt violence; but fled for his life, and hid himſelf in Caves and Mountains. Nay, when *Saul* was delivered into his hands by God, he durſt not ſtretch out his hand againſt the Lord's Anointed.

But to proceed in the ſtory. *Solomon*, *David*'s ſon, who ſucceeded him in his Kingdom, did all thoſe things which God had expreſly forbid the King to do. He ſent into *Egypt* for Horſes, 1 *Kings* 10.28. He multiplied Wives, and *loved many ſtrange women, (together with the daughter of Pharoah) women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites*, 1 Kings 11.1. He multiplied

Silver and Gold, 10 *chap.* 27. contrary to the command of God. For this God (who is the onely Judge of Soveraign Princes) was very angry with him, and threatens to rend the *Kingdom* from him; which was afterwards accompliſhed in the days of *Rehoboam:* but yet this did not give authoritie to his Subjects to rebel. If to be under the direction and obligation of Laws, makes a limited Monarchie, it is certain the *Kingdom* of *Iſrael* was ſo. There were ſome things which the *King* was expreſly forbid to do, as you have already heard; and the Law of *Moſes* was to be the rule of his government, the ſtanding Law of his Kingdom. And therefore he was commanded, when he came to the Throne, *to write a copy of the law with his own hand, and to read in it all his days, that he might learn to fear the Lord his God, and to keep all the words of this law, and theſe Statutes to do them,* 17 Deut. 18, 19, 20. and yet he was a ſoveraign Prince: if he broke theſe Laws, God was his Judge and avenger; but he was accountable to no earthly Tribunal.

Baaſha killed *Nadab* the ſon of *Jeroboam,* and reigned in his ſtead, 1 *Kings* 15.

15. 25,26,27. and for this and his other ſins, God threatens evil againſt *Baaſha*, and againſt his houſe, 16 *Chron.* 7. *Zimri* ſlew *Elah* the ſon of *Baaſha*, and ſlew all the houſe of *Baaſha*; but he did not long enjoy the Kingdom, which he had uſurpt by treaſon and murder: for he reigned but ſeven days in *Tirzah*; which being beſieged and taken by *Omri*, he went into the Palace of the King's houſe, and burnt the King's houſe over him with fire, and died, *v.* 18.

This example *Jezebel* threatned *Jehu* with: *Had Zimri peace, who ſlew his maſter?* 2 Kings 9. 31. and yet *Nadab* and *Elah* were both of them very wicked Princes. And if that would juſtifie Treaſon and Murder, both *Baaſha* and *Zimri* had been very innocent.

This is a ſufficient evidence, how ſacred and inviolable the Perſons and Authority of the *Jewiſh Kings* were, during the time of that Monarchie. But it will not be amiſs, briefly to conſider what obligations the *Jews* were under to be ſubject to the higher powers, when they were carried captive into *Babylon*. Now the Prophet *Jeremiah* had given an expreſs command to them, *Seek the peace of the city whither I have*

cauſed you to be carried away captives, and pray to the Lord for it: for in the peace thereof ye ſhall have peace, 29 Jer. 7. Which made it a neceſſary duty to be ſubject to thoſe powers, under whoſe government they lived. And accordingly we find, that *Mordecai* diſcovered the Treaſon *of Bigthana and Tereſh, two of the King's Chamberlains, the Keepers of the door, who ſought to lay hand on the King Ahaſuerus,* 6 Eſther 2. And how numerous and powerful the *Jews* were at this time, and what great diſturbance they could have given to the *Empire*, appears evidently from the book of *Eſther*. *King Ahaſuerus;* upon the ſuggeſtions of *Haman*, had granted a Decree for the deſtruction of the whole People of the *Jews*; which was ſent into all the Provinces, written and ſealed with the King's ring. This Decree could never be reverſed again; for that was contrary to the Laws of the *Medes* and *Perſians*. And therefore when *Eſther* had found favour with the *King*, all that could be done for the *Jews*, was to grant another Decree for them to defend themſelves; which accordingly was done, and the effect of it was this: *That the Jews at Shuſan ſlew three hundred*

dred men, and the Jews of the other Provinces ſlew ſeventy and five thouſand, and reſted from their enemies, 9 Eſther 15, 16, 17. Without this Decree, *Mordecai* did not think it lawful to reſiſt, (which yet was a caſe of as great extremity and barbarous cruelty, as could ever happen) which made him put *Eſther* upon ſo hazardous an attempt, as to venture into the King's preſence, without being called; which was death by their Law, unleſs the King ſhould graciouſly hold out the golden Scepter to them, 4 *Eſth.* 11. and yet when they had obtained this Decree, they were able to defend themſelves, and to deſtroy their enemies; which is as famous an example of *Paſſive Obedience*, as can be met with in any *Hiſtory*. And therefore the Prophet *Daniel* acknowledges to *Belteſhazzar, The moſt high God gave Nebuchadnezzar thy Father a Kingdom, and Majeſty, and Glory, and Honour: and for the Majeſty that he gave him, all People, nations, and languages trembled and feared before him. Whom he would he ſlew, and whom he would he kept alive; and whom he would he ſet up, and whom he would he pulled down,* 5 Dan. 18, 19. And if theſe Heathen Kings receive their power from God,

God, as the Prophet here affirms, St. *Paul* has made the application of it, *That he that reſiſteth, reſiſteth the ordinance of God.*

This may ſerve for the times of the Old Teſtament; and I ſhall conclude theſe teſtimonies with the ſaying of the wiſe man, who was both a Prophet and a King: *I counſel thee to keep the King's commandment, and that in regard of the oath of God: Be not haſty to go out of his ſight, ſtand not in an evil thing; for he doth whatſoever pleaſeth him. Where the word of a King is, there is power; and who may ſay unto him, What doſt thou?* 8 Eccl. 2, 3, 4.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The Doctrine of Chriſt concerning Non-reſiſtance.

LEt us now conſider, what Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught and practiſed about Obedience to *Soveraign Princes*; whereby we may learn, how far Chriſtians are obliged by theſe Laws of *Subjection* and *Non-reſiſtance.*

1. I ſhall diſtinctly conſider the Doctrine of Chriſt while he lived on Earth: and here are ſeveral things very fit to be obſerved.

1. We have no reaſon to ſuſpect, that Chriſt would alter the rights of Soveraign power, and the meaſures of obedience and ſubjection, which were fixt and determined by God himſelf. This was no part of his Commiſſion, to change the external forms and polities of Civil governments, which is an act of ſecular power and authority, and does not belong to a *Spiritual Prince.* He who would not undertake to decide a petty

petty controversie, or to divide an inheritance between two contending brethren, 12 *Luke* 13, 14. can we think that he would attempt any thing of that vast consequence, as the changes and alterations of Civil Power, which would have unsetled the Fundamental Constitutions of all the governments of the world at that time?

Our Saviour tells us, that *he came not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil it*, πληρῶσαι, to fill it up, to compleat and perfect it, 5 *Matth.* 17. that is, to fulfil the ancient types and prophecies in his own Person, to perfect an external and ceremonial, by a real and Evangelical righteousnes, to perfect the Moral Laws with new instances and degrees of vertue; but he abrogated no Moral Law, and therefore not the Laws of Obedience and Subjection to *Princes*, which has always been reduced to the fifth Commandment. Nay, he abrogated no Laws, but by perfecting and fulfilling them; and therefore he could make no alteration in the *Doctrine* of *Non-resistance*, which is as perfect subjection as can or ought to be paid to Soveraign Princes. His *Kingdom was not of this world*, as he told *Pilate*: though he

was

was a King, he neither was an enemy nor rival to *Cæſar*; but had he abſolved his Diſciples from their obedience to *Princes*, had he made it in any caſe lawful to reſiſt, (which was ſo expreſly forbid the *Jews* by God himſelf, and which is ſuch a contradiction to the very notion of Soveraign Power) he had been ſomewhat worſe than a Rival to all the *Princes* of the Earth; for though he had ſet up no Kingdom of his own, yet he had pulled down theirs. Whereas he took great care, that his Religion ſhould give no diſturbance to the world, nor create any reaſonable jealouſies and ſuſpicions to *Princes*, who had been very excuſable for their averſion to Chriſtianity, had it invaded the *Rights* and *Royalties* of their *Crowns*.

This makes it very improbable that our *Saviour* ſhould make any alterations in Civil powers, or abridge the *rights* of *Soveraignty*; which is ſo foreign to his deſign of coming into the world, and ſo incongruous to the Perſon which he ſuſtained: and yet he could not alter the duties of Subjects, but he muſt alter the *rights* of *Princes* too; he muſt take away the Soveraign power of *Princes*, at the ſame time that he

he makes it lawful for Subjects in any case whatsoever to resist. We may safely then conclude, that our Saviour has left the government of the world as he found it: he has indeed given such admirable Laws, as will teach *Princes* to govern, and Subjects to obey better; which is the most effectual way to secure the publick peace and happiness, to prevent the Oppression of Subjects, and Rebellions against *Princes:* but he has not interposed in new modelling the Governments of the world, which is not of such consequence, as some men imagine. It is not the external form of Government, but the Fatherly care and Prudence and Justice of *Governours*, and the dutiful obedience of Subjects, which can make any people happy. If Princes and Subjects be good Christians, they may be happy under most forms of Government; if they be not, they can be happy under none. Had our Saviour given Subjects Liberty to Resist, to Depose, to Murder *Tyrannical Princes*, he had done them no kindness at all; for to give liberty to Subjects to resist, is only to proclaim an universal licence to Factions and Seditions, and Civil Wars; and if any man can think this

such

ſuch a mighty bleſſing to the world, yet methinks it is not a bleſſing proper for the *Prince of peace* to give. But he who inſtructs *Princes* to rule as God's Miniſters and Vicegerents, and to expreſs a Fatherly Care and concernment for the happineſs of their Subjects, and that teaches Subjects to reverence and obey their *Prince*, as the Image of God, and quietly to ſubmit and yield to his authority, and that inforces theſe Laws both on Princes and Subjects in the Name and Authority of God, and from the conſideration of the future judgment, when Princes who abuſe their power ſhall give an account of it to their great Maſter, when Subjects who reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation, and thoſe, who patiently and quietly ſuffer for God's ſake, ſhall have their injuries redreſt, and their obedience rewarded: I ſay, ſuch a Perſon as this, takes a more effectual courſe to reform the abuſes of civil power, and to preſerve good government in the world, than all our *wiſe Politicians* and *State-menders*, who think to reform the government of the world, by ſome State-ſpells and charms, without reforming thoſe who govern, and thoſe who are gover-

governed. This our Saviour has done, and this is the best thing that could be done, nay this was all that he could do in this matter. He never usurpt any civil power and authority, and therefore could not new model the governments of the world: he never offers any external force and compulsion to make men obey his Laws, and therefore neither forces Princes to rule well, nor Subjects to obey; but he has taken the same care of the government of the World, as he has done of all the other duties of Piety and Vertue; that is, he has given very good Laws, and threatned those who break them with eternal punishments: and as the Laws and Religion of our Saviour prevail, so will the governments of the world mend, without altering the Model and Constitution of them.

2. But yet we have some positive evidence, what our Saviour taught about Obedience to the higher powers. I shall give you two instances of it, which are as plain and express, as can be desired.

1. The first is, that answer our *Saviour* gave to the *Pharisees* and *Herodians*, when they consulted together to intangle

tangle him in his talk, 22 *Matth.* 15. &c. They come to him with great ceremony and addreſs, as to an infallible Oracle, to conſult him in a very weighty caſe of Conſcience. They expreſs a great eſteem and aſſurance of his ſincerity, and faithfulneſs, and courage, as well as of his unerring judgment, in declaring the will of God to them. *Maſter, we know that thou art true, and teacheſt the way of God in Truth, neither careſt thou for any man, for thou regardeſt not the Perſon of man*; that is, thou wilt not conceal nor pervert the truth for fear nor favour: and then they propoſe an inſnaring queſtion to him. *Tell us therefore, what thinkeſt thou? is it lawful to give Tribute to* Cæſar, *or not?* They thought it impoſſible that he ſhould give any anſwer to this, which would not make him abnoxious, either to the *Roman Governours*, if he denied that the *Jews* might lawfully pay Tribute to *Cæſar*, or to the Phariſees and People, if he affirmed that they might: for there was a very potent Faction among them, who thought it unlawful for the *Jews* to own the authority or uſurpations of any *Foreign Prince*, or to pay Tribute to him, as to their *King*. They being

expreſly forbid by their Law, *to ſet a ſtranger over them for their King, who is not their Brother,* (*i.e.*) who is not a natural *Jew*, 17 *Deuter.* 15. and it ſeems they could not diſtinguiſh between their own voluntary Act in chooſing a ſtranger for their King, [which was indeed forbid by their Law] and their ſubmitting to a *Foreign Prince*, when they were Conquered by him. Our Saviour, who knew their wicked intention in all this, that they did not come with an honeſt deſign to be inſtructed in their duty, but to ſeek an advantage againſt him, expreſſes ſome indignation at it: *Why tempt ye me, ye Hypocrites?* but yet to return them an anſwer to that their queſtion, he bids them ſhew him the *Tribute-money*, that is, the money in which they uſed to pay Tribute, and inquires whoſe Image and Superſcription it had. For Coining of money was as certain a mark of Soveraignty, as making Laws, or the power of the Sword. Well, they acknowledge that the Image and Superſcription on the Tribute-money was *Cæſars*; upon which he replies, *Render therefore unto Cæſar the things that are Cæſars, and unto God the things that are God's.* The plain meaning of which anſwer

anſwer is this, That ſince by the very impreſſion on their money, it is evident, that *Cæſar* is their *Sovereign Lord*, they muſt render to him all the *rights* of *Soveraignty*, among which *Tribute* is one, as St. *Paul* tells us, *Render therefore unto all their dues, Tribute to whom Tribute is due, Cuſtom to whom Cuſtom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour*, 13 *Rom.* 7. Whatever is due to *Soveraign Princes*, and does not interfere with their duty to God, that they muſt give to *Cæſar*, who at this time was their *Soveraign*. In which anſwer there are ſeveral things obſervable.

1. That our Saviour does not examine into *Cæſar*'s right, nor how he came by this Soveraign power; but as he found him in poſſeſſion of it, ſo he leaves him, and requires them to render to him all the *rights* of *Soveraignty*.

2. That he does not particularly determine, what the things of *Cæſar are*, that is, what his *right* is, as a *Soveraign Prince*. Hence ſome men conclude, that this Text can prove nothing; that we cannot learn from it, what our Saviour's Judgment was in this point; that it is only a ſubtil anſwer, which thoſe who askt the queſtion could make nothing of;

which was a proper return to their enſnaring queſtion. This, I think, is as great a reproach to our Saviour, as they can well caſt upon him, that he, who was the wiſdom of God, the great *Prophet* and *Teacher* of Mankind, ſhould return as ſophiſtical and doubtful anſwers, as the *Heathen Oracles*, and that in a caſe, which required, and would admit a very plain anſwer. It is true, many times our Saviour, when he diſcourſt of what concerned his own Perſon, or the Myſteries of his Kingdom, which were not fit at that time to be publiſht in plain terms, uſed a myſtical Language; as when he called his body the *Temple*, or he taught them by *Parables*, which were not obvious at the firſt hearing, but ſtill what he ſaid, had a certain and determined ſenſe, and what was obſcure and difficult, he explained privately to his Apoſtles, that in due time they might explain it to others; but to aſſert, as theſe men muſt do, that Chriſt gave them ſuch an anſwer as ſignifyed nothing, and which he intended they ſhould underſtand nothing by, ſhews that they are not ſo civil to our Saviour as theſe *Phariſees* and *Herodians* were, who at leaſt owned in Complement, *Maſter*,

we

we know that thou art true, and teacheſt the way of God in Truth, neither careſt thou for any man, for thou regardeſt not the Perſon of men.

But certainly the *Phariſees* did believe, that there was ſomething in our Saviour's anſwer; for *they marvelled, and left him, and went their way:* and yet thoſe who had wit enough to ask ſuch enſnaring queſtions, could not be ſo dull as to be put off with a ſophiſtical anſwer, (an art below the gravity of our Saviours Perſon and Office) but would have urged it a little further, had they not been ſenſible, that they were ſufficiently anſwered, and had nothing to reply.

For indeed, can any thing be plainer than our Saviour's anſwer? They ask him, whether it were lawful to pay Tribute to *Cæſar*; he does not indeed in expreſs words ſay, that they ſhould pay Tribute to *Cæſar*, but he gives them ſuch an anſwer, as withal convinc'd them of the reaſon and neceſſity of it. He asks whoſe Image and Superſcription was on the Tribute-money; they tell him *Cæſar's*; from whence he infers, *Render therefore unto Cæſar the things that are Cæſar's. Therefore? wherefore?* becauſe

the Tribute-money had *Cæſar*'s Image on it; therefore they muſt render to *Cæſar the things that are Cæſar*'s; which certainly ſignifies, that *Tribute* was one of thoſe things which belonged to *Cæſar*, and muſt be rendred to him, as appeared by it's having *Cæſar*'s Image: not as if every thing that had *Cæſar*'s mark and ſtamp on it, did belong to *Cæſar*, and muſt be given to him, (as ſome men profanely enough, how wittily ſoever they imagine, burleſque and ridicule our Saviour's anſwer) for at this rate all the money of the Empire, which bore his Image, was *Cæſar*'s; but the money which was ſtampt with *Cæſar*'s Image, and was the currant money of the Nation, was a plain ſign, as I obſerved before, that he was their Soveraign, and paying *Tribute* was a known right due to *Soveraign Princes*; and therefore the very money which they uſed, with *Cæſar*'s Image on it, reſolved that queſtion, not only of the lawfulneſs, but the neceſſity of paying *Tribute*: and this was ſo plain an anſwer, that the *Phariſees* were aſhamed of their queſtion, and went away without making any reply; for they no more dared to deny that *Cæſar* was their King, than they thought

thought he dared either to own or deny the lawfulneſs of paying *Tribute* to *Cæſar*. And this was all the ſubtilty of our Saviour's anſwer.

But then our Saviour not confining his anſwer meerly to the caſe of paying *Tribute*, but anſwering in general, that we muſt render to *Cæſar* the things that are *Cæſar*'s, extends this to all the *rights* of *Soveraign Princes*, and ſo becomes a ſtanding rule in all caſes, to give to *Cæſar* what is *Cæſar*'s due. And when our Saviour commands us to *render to Cæſar the things which are Cæſar's*, without telling us what *Cæſar*'s things are, this is ſo far from making his anſwer doubtful and ambiguous, and of no uſe in this preſent Controverſie, that it ſuggeſts to us three plain and natural conſequences, which are ſufficient to end this whole diſpute.

1. That our Saviour did not intend to make any alteration in the rights of *Soveraignty*, but what *rights* he found *Soveraign Princes* poſſeſt of, he leaves them in the quiet poſſeſſion of; for had he intended to make any change in this matter, he would not have given ſuch a general rule, *to render to Cæſar the things which are Cæſar's*, without ſpecifying what theſe things are.

2. And therefore he leaves them to the known Laws of the Empire to determine what is *Cæſar*'s right. Whatever is eſſential to the notion of *Soveraing Power*, whatever the Laws and Cuſtoms of Nations determine to be *Cæſar*'s right, that they muſt render to him; for he would make no alteration in this matter. So that ſubjection to *Princes*, and *Non-reſiſtance*, is as plainly determined by our Saviour in this Law, as paying *Tribute*; for ſubjection and *Non-reſiſtance* is as eſſential a *right* of *Soveraign Power*, and as inſeparable from the notion of it, as any thing can be. So it is acknowledged by the Laws and Cuſtoms of Nations, and ſo it is determined by the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter.

3. I obſerve farther, that when our Saviour joyns our duty to our *Prince*, with our duty to our God, *render to Cæſar the things which are Cæſars, and to God the things which are God's*, he excepts nothing from *Cæſar*'s *right*, which by the Laws of Nations is due to Sovereign Princes, but what is a violation of, and an encroachment on Gods right and Soveraignty; that is, we muſt pay all that Obedience and Subjection to *Princes*,

Princes which is conſiſtent with our duty to God. This is the onely limit our Saviour ſets to our duty to *Princes*. If they ſhould command us to renounce our Religion, and worſhip falſe Gods; if they ſhould challenge divine honours to themſelves, as ſome of the *Roman Emperours* did; this we muſt not do, becauſe it is to renounce obedience and ſubjection to God, who has a more ſoveraign power, and a greater right in us, than our *Prince*: But all active and paſſive obedience, which is conſiſtent with a good conſcience towards God, and required of us by the Laws of our *Country*, and the eſſential rights of Soveraignty, is what we owe to our *Prince*, and what by our Saviour's command we muſt render to him. This I hope is ſufficient for the explication of our Saviour's anſwer to the *Phariſees* and *Herodians*, which evidently contains the Doctrine of obedience and ſubjection to *Princes*, enforced on us by the authority of our Saviour himſelf.

2. Our Saviour's rebuke to St. *Peter*, when he drew his ſword and ſtruck a ſervant of the high Prieſt and ſmote off his ear, is as plain a declaration againſt reſiſtance, as words can make it, 26 *Mat.* 52.

52. *Then ſaid Jeſus unto him, Put up thy ſword into his place: for all they that take the ſword, ſhall periſh with the ſword.* For the underſtanding of which, we muſt conſider upon what occaſion St. *Peter* drew his ſword: for we muſt not think that our Saviour does abſolutely forbid the uſe of the ſword; which is to deſtroy all civil governments, and the power of *Princes*, and to proclaim impunity to all the villanies which were committed in the world. The ſword is neceſſary to puniſh wickedneſs, and to protect the innocent. In the hands of *Princes* it is an inſtrument of Juſtice, as St. *Paul* tells us, *That they bear not the ſword in vain, but are the miniſters of God, revengers to execute wrath upon him that doth evil*, 13 Rom. 4. In the hands of private Perſons it may be lawfully uſed in ſelf-defence. Thus our Saviour, a little before his crucifixion, gave commiſſion to his Diſciples to furniſh themſelves with ſwords, though they parted with their garment for the purchaſe, 22 *Luke* 36. Which we may ſuppoſe was not deſigned as a meer modiſh and faſhionable thing, but to defend themſelves from the private aſſaults of robbers, and ſuch-like common enemies, who, as *Joſephus* tells us,

us, were very numerous at that time. For no man wants authority to defend his life againſt him who has no authority to take it away.

But the caſe of St. *Peter* was very different: he drew his ſword indeed in his *Maſter*'s defence, but againſt a lawful authority. The officers of the *Chief Prieſts* and *Phariſees* came with *Judas* to the place where *Jeſus* was, to ſeize on him. This was a lawful authority, though employed upon a very unjuſt errand; but Authority muſt not be reſiſted, though in defence of the greateſt innocence. Men who draw their ſwords againſt lawful powers, ſhall periſh with the ſword. Which does not ſignifie what the event ſhall always be, but what is the deſert and merit of the action. *Rebels* may ſometimes be proſperous, but they always deſerve puniſhment; and if they eſcape the ſword in this world, St. *Paul* tells us, they ſhall receive Damnation in the next.

What can be ſaid more expreſly againſt reſiſtance than this? St. *Peter* never could have drawn his ſword in a better cauſe, never in the defence of a more ſacred Perſon. If we may defend oppreſs'd Innocence againſt a lawful authority,

rity, if we may oppoſe unjuſt and illegal violence, if any obligations of friendſhip, gratitude, or Religion it ſelf could juſtifie reſiſtance, St. *Peter* had not met with this rebuke. What, ſhould he tamely ſuffer his Lord and Maſter to be betrayed, the moſt admirable example of univerſal Righteouſneſs and goodneſs that ever appeared in the world? Shall one who had done no evil, who had neither offended againſt the Laws of God nor men, who had ſpent his whole time in doing good, be ſo barbarouſly uſed, and treated like the vileſt Malefactor? Shall he who was ſo famous for miracles, who gave eyes to the blind, and feet to the lame, ſhall he who was the great Prophet ſent from God to inſtruct the world, ſhall their dear Maſter be haled away from them, and they ſtand by, and ſee it, & ſuffer it? Thus might S. *Peter* have argued for himſelf. But though it was a very unjuſt action, yet it was done by a juſt authority: and lawful Powers muſt not be reſiſted, though it were in defence of the Saviour of the world. And if St. *Peter* might not uſe the ſword in defence of Chriſt's Perſon, there is much leſs pretence to fight for his religion: for though ſome call this fighting for religion,

gion, it is onely fighting for themſelves. Men may keep their religion, if they pleaſe, in deſpite of earthly powers; and therefore no powers can hurt religion, though they may perſecute the Profeſſors of it: And therefore when men take up arms to avoid perſecution, it is not in defence of religion, but of themſelves, that is, to avoid their ſuffering for religion. And if St. *Peter* might not fight to preſerve Chriſt himſelf, certainly neither he nor we might take up arms to defend our ſelves from perſecution. Chriſt was the firſt *Martyr* for his own religion; his perſon was infinitely more ſacred and inviolable than any of us can pretend to be. And if St. *Peter* muſt not fight for Chriſt, certainly we muſt not fight for our ſelves, though we abſurdly enough call it fighting for our religion.

And who were theſe powers St. *Peter* reſiſted? They were onely the ſervants and officers of the *High-prieſt.* The High-Prieſt did not appear there himſelf; much leſs *Pilate,* much leſs *Cæſar:* and yet our Saviour rebukes St. *Peter* for reſiſting the inferiour officers, though they offered the moſt unjuſt and illegal violence. It ſeems, he did not underſtand

stand our modern distinctions between the *Person* and the *Authority* of the *Prince*; That though his person be sacred, and must not be toucht, yet his Ministers, who act by his authority, may be opposed. We may fight his Navies, and demolish his Garrisons, and kill his subjects, who fight for him, though we must not touch his Person. But he is a mock-*Prince*, whose authority is confined to his own Person, who can do nothing more than what he can do with his two hands; which cannot answer the ends of Government. A *Prince* is not meerly a natural, but a Political person, and his personal Authority reaches as far as his commission does. His Officers and Ministers of State, and commanders, and souldiers, are his hands, and eyes, and ears, and legs; and he who resisteth those who act by his commission, may as properly be said to resist the Personal authority of the *Prince*, as if he himself were present in his natural Person, as well as by his authority. Thus our Saviour, it seems, thought, when he rebuked St. *Peter* for striking a servant of the *High-priest*, and smiting off his ear.

And if S. *Peter* were rebuk'd for this, how comes

comes the *Pope* to challenge the ſword in S. *Peter*'s right, when our *Saviour* would not allow S. *Peter* to uſe it himſelf? And if St. *Peter* might not draw his ſword againſt an inferiour officer, by what authority does the Pope pretend to diſpoſe of Crowns and Scepters, and to trample on the necks of the greateſt Monarchs? And I ſuppoſe the *Presbyter* can challenge no more authority than the *Pope*. Whether they will allow St. *Peter* to have been a *Biſhop* or *Presbyter*, this command to put up his ſword, equally concerns him in all capacities, and ought to ſecure ſoveraign Princes from the unjuſt uſurpations and treacherous conſpiracies both of *GENEVA* and *ROME*.

There is but one Objection, that I know of, againſt all this from the Doctrine of our Saviour, and that is, that he ſeems to diſallow that very authority which is exerciſed by *ſecular Princes*; and therefore cannot be thought ſuch a ſevere Preacher of obedience & ſubjection: for Authority and Subjection are correlates, they have a mutual reſpect to each other; and therefore they muſt ſtand or fall together. There is no authority where there is no ſubjection due, & there can be no ſubjection due where there is

no

no authority. And yet this is the Doctrine which Chriſt taught his Diſciples, 20 *Mat.* 25, 26, 27, 28 *v. Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exerciſe dominion over them, and they that are great, exerciſe authority upon them. But it ſhall not be ſo among you: but whoſoever will be great among you, let him be your miniſter. And whoſoever will be chief among you, let him be your ſervant. Even as the Son of man came not to be miniſtred unto, but to miniſter, and to give his life a ranſom for many.* This text has been preſs'd to ſerve as many ill purpoſes, as moſt *texts* in the *Bible*; and therefore deſerves to be carefully conſidered. Some hence infer, that it is unlawful for a Chriſtian to be a *Magiſtrate*, or a *King*. As if our Saviour either intended that humane ſocieties ſhould be deprived of the advantages of government, which is the greateſt temporal bleſſing and ſecurity to mankind; or had made it neceſſary that ſome men ſhould continue Heathens and Infidels, that they might govern Chriſtians: which I doubt would be a ſore temptation to many to renounce Chriſtianity, if they could gain a temporal Crown by it.

Others from hence conclude, that there

there muſt be no *ſuperiority of degree* between the Miniſters of the Goſpel, but they muſt be all *equal*; as if becauſe the Apoſtles were to be all equal, without any ſuperiority over each other, therefore they were to have no ſuperiority over inferiour Miniſters. As if becauſe the *Apoſtles* might not exerciſe ſuch a ſecular power and ſoveraignty as the *Kings of the Gentiles* did, therefore there muſt be no different degrees of power in the *Miniſters* of the *Church*; that is, that becauſe ſecular and ſpiritual power differ in the whole kind, therefore there are no different degrees of ſpiritual power. As if *Chriſt* himſelf were not ſuperiour to his *Apoſtles*, becauſe he did not aſſume to himſelf the ſecular authority of earthly *Princes*, but came not to be miniſtred unto, but to miniſter, as he commands them to do according to his example.

Others conclude, that at leaſt *Chriſtian Princes* muſt not uſurp ſuch a ſoveraign, and abſolute, and uncontroulable power as the *Princes of the Gentiles* did, but muſt remember that they are but the Publick Servants and Miniſters of the Commonwealth, and may be reſiſted, and called to an account by their

people for the male-adminiſtration of government. But how they infer this, I confeſs, I cannot tell: for it is evident our Saviour does not here ſpeak one word in derogation to that civil power and authority which was exerciſed by *ſecular Princes.* He tells us indeed, that the *Princes of the Gentiles exerciſe dominion over them*, and *they that are great, exerciſe authority upon them:* But does he blame the exerciſe of this authority? Does he ſet any narrower bounds or limits, than what the *Heathen Princes* challenged? By no means; he ſays not one word of any ſuch matter. St. *Matthew* indeed expreſſes this power of *Princes* by κατακυριεύουσιν, and κατεξουσιάζουσιν, which ſome think intimates the abuſe of their Authority: but St. *Luke* renders it by κυριεύουσιν, and ἐξουσιάζουσιν, which onely ſignifies the exerciſe of *ſoveraign power.* And though moſt of the *Roman Emperours* were guilty of very great miſcarriages in government, yet our Saviour onely refers to that lawful authority wherewith they were inveſted, not to the abuſe of it: and therefore he takes notice of that honourable Title which was given to many *Roman Emperours*, that they were called Εὐεργέται, or Benefactors; which

which certainly does not argue his diſlike of civil Authoritie. But all that our Saviour tells his Diſciples is, that it ſhould not be ſo among them, that they ſhould not exerciſe ſuch a ſecular power and authoritie as *earthly Princes* do. Now is it any diſparagement to *Kingly power*, to tell a *Biſhop* that he muſt not exerciſe ſuch a ſoveraign authoritie over the Church, as the *Prince* does over the State? which is the whole of what our Saviour intended in this place.

For the occaſion of theſe words, St. *Matthew* tells us, was to check that vain ambition of *Zebedee's two ſons*, who came to *Chriſt*, and employed their *Mother* to ask of him, *that one might ſit on his right hand, and the other on his left hand, in his Kingdom*; that is, that they might have the greateſt places of dignitie and power next himſelf. St. *Luke* tells us, that it was to compoſe that ſtriſe and contention which was among them, which of them ſhould be accounted the greateſt; which moſt likely refers to the ſame ſtory, though it is plain they quarrelled more than once about this matter. And the occaſion of all theſe quarrels, was a miſtake of the nature of *Chriſt's Kingdom*. They, as well as

the rest of the *Jews*, expected their *Messias* should be a *Temporal Prince*; and *they* being convinced by the Miracles of *Christ*, that he was indeed the *Messias who was to come*, they lived in dayly expectation when he would take the *Kingdom* upon himself; and then they did not doubt but that they should be the *chief Ministers of State*, and have the greatest places of trust and power in his *Kingdom:* & this made them jealous of each others greatness, and so forward to bespeak *preferments* for themselves. Now to cure these earthly ambitions, he tells them, that his *Kingdom* was no such thing as they dreamt of, and that he had no such preferments for them as they expected.

Earthly Princes lived in great Pomp and Splendour, and had great Places of trust and honour to bestow on their servants; but they saw no such thing in him: *he came not to be ministred unto, but to minister*, to live a mean, industrious, and laborious life, and to die as a Malefactor, *and give his life a ransom for many*. And they could not expect by being his servants, to be advanced to secular power and authoritie, which he had not himself; but when he came into his

King-

Kingdom, they ſhould indeed ſhare with him in his power and authoritie; *they ſhould ſit upon twelve Thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Iſrael*; that is, they ſhould have the ſupreme authoritie in his Church, which is his ſpiritual Kingdom. But there was nothing of external ſtate and grandeur in this, as they expected; but it was a life of humilitie and modeſtie, and contempt of this world, and earthly greatneſs. The greateſt Miniſters in his Kingdom muſt be as humble as a child, as he elſewhere tells them, and as diligent and induſtrious, and condeſcending, as the meaneſt ſervant, and ſhould very often differ nothing from ſervants in their external fortune and condition of life. This is the ſum of what our Saviour here teaches his Diſciples; and he is a wonderful man, and very quick-ſighted, who can diſcover any reflection on civil power and authoritie in all this.

I ſhall onely obſerve farther, that when our Saviour calls them here, the *Princes* and *Kings of the Gentiles or Nations*, he does not ſpeak this in diſparagement of them, that they were onely *Heathen* and *Infidel Princes*, who did this: for there were no other *Princes*

at that time in the world. *Heathen* and *Pagan Princes* ſounds now as a note of infamie, whereby they are diſtinguiſhed from *Chriſtian Kings and Princes*; but the *Kings* of the *Gentiles* or *Nations* in our Saviour's time, ſignified no more than *Soveraign Princes*, who were inveſted with civil authoritie: And our Saviour onely diſtinguiſhes between that civil power and authoritie which was exerciſed by *ſecular Princes*, and that *ſpiritual Kingdom* which he was now about to erect in the world; and the diſtinction had been of the ſame force, though there had been at that time Jewiſh or Chriſtian, as well as Heathen Princes. Still the difference between Civil and Eccleſiaſtical authoritie is the ſame; and no Apoſtle or Biſhop, as ſuch, can challenge the power or authoritie of earthly Princes, or any ſhare in it.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

What we may learn from our Saviour's Practice about NON-RESISTANCE.

HAving ſeen what the Doctrine of our Saviour was, let us now conſider his *Practice.* And we need not doubt but our Saviour lived, as he preacht. He taught his Diſciples by his example, as well as by his Laws. His Life was the beſt Comment upon his Sermons, was a viſible Lecture of univerſal Righteouſneſs and goodneſs; and it is impoſſible to conceive a more perfect and abſolute example of *Subjection* and *Non-reſiſtance,* than our Saviour has ſet us.

When our Saviour appeared in the world, the *Jews* were very weary of the *Roman yoke,* and in earneſt expectation of their *Meſſias,* who, as they thought, would reſtore the Kingdom again unto *Iſrael*; and this expectation of their *Meſſias*, whom they miſtook for a *Tem-*

poral Prince, made them very apt to joyn with any one, who pretended to be the *Meſſias*, and to rebel againſt the *Roman* government. Such moſt likely were *Theudas* and *Judas* of *Galilee*, of whom we have mention, 5 *Acts* 36, 37. and it is not impoſſible but the *Ægyptian*, who led 4000 men into the wilderneſs, 2 *Acts* 38. either pretended to be the *Meſſias*, or ſome fore-runner of him: to be ſure, ſuch were thoſe *falſe Chriſts*, and *falſe Prophets*, of whom our Saviour warns his Diſciples, 24 *Matth.* 23. *Then if any man ſhall ſay unto you, Lo here is Chriſt, or there, believe it not.*

This being the temper of the *Jewiſh Nation* at that time, ſo extreamly inclined to *Seditions*, and *Rebellion* againſt the *Roman powers*, how eaſie had it been for our Saviour, had he pleaſed, to have made himſelf very potent and formidable! how eaſie could he have gained even the *Scribes* and *Phariſees* to his party, (whoſe great quarrel was at his meanneſs and poverty) would he once have declared himſelf a *Temporal Prince*, and invaded the Throne! But he was ſo far from this, that when he perceived the people had an intention to take him by force and make him a King, he withdrew

drew himſelf privately from them, *and departed into a mountain himſelf alone,* 6 *John* 15. and yet I preſume, there might have been as many plauſible pretences to have juſtifyed a *Rebellion* then, as ever there were in any *Nation* ſince. He had at that time fed *five thouſand men, beſides women and children, with five barley loaves and two ſmall fiſhes*; and what a formidable Enemy would he have been, who could Victual an Army by Miracles, and could, when he pleaſed, conquer by the ſame miraculous power alſo! this the people, whom he had miraculouſly fed, were very ſenſible of, and did hence conclude, that *he was the Prophet that ſhould come into the world*, and that it was time to take him, and ſet him upon the Throne: but though our Saviour was indeed the *Meſſias*, yet he was not ſuch a *Meſſias*, as they expected; he was not a *Temporal Prince*, and therefore would not countenance their *Rebellion* againſt *Cæſar*, though it were to make himſelf a *King*.

It is ſufficiently known, that Chriſt ſubmitted to the moſt unjuſt ſentence, to the moſt ignominious and painful death, rather than reſiſt the *higher powers*, though he could ſo eaſily have *called for Le-*

Legions of Angels to his rescue. But he went as a lamb to the slaughter, and as the sheep before the shearer is dumb, so he opened not his mouth: when he was reviled, he reviled not again; when he suffered he threatned not, but committed himself to him who judgeth righteously. He rebuked *Peter*, when he drew his Sword in his defence, and tells *Pilate* the reason, why he was so easily apprehended, and used at their pleasure, without any resistance and opposition, though he had been formerly attended with such crouds of his *Disciples*; Because he was no *Temporal Prince*, and therefore did not require his *Disciples* to fight for him, as other *Temporal Princes* used to do. *Jesus answered, My Kingdom is not of this world: if my Kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my Kingdom not from hence*, 18 *John* 36. Which plainly shews, that our Saviour's subjection was not matter of force and constraint, because he wanted power to resist; but it was matter of choice, that which was most agreeable to the nature of his *Kingdom*, which was not to be propagated by carnal weapons, but by suffering and death.

And

And when our *Saviour* has ſet us ſuch an example as this, it is wonderful to me, that any, who call themſelves his *Diſciples*, can think it lawful to *Rebel* againſt their *Prince*, and defend themſelves from the moſt unjuſt violence by a more unjuſt reſiſtance. But there are few men, who are contented to follow Chriſt to the Croſs; they do not like that part of his example, and are willing to perſwade themſelves, that they are not bound to imitate it. And there are two things, which I find urged by ſome men to this purpoſe, which muſt be briefly conſidered.

1. That it is no wonder, that Chriſt ſuffered patiently and quietly without reſiſting the moſt unjuſt violence, becauſe he came into the world to die, and to make his Soul an offering for ſin. And how could ſo innocent a perſon die, but by the hands of *unjuſt* and *Tyrannical powers?* and it was inconſiſtent with his deſign of dying for ſin, to reſiſt and oppoſe. This is the account our Saviour himſelf gives of his patient ſuffering. When St. *Peter* drew his Sword in his defence, he tells him, *Thinkeſt thou, that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he ſhall preſently give me more than twelve Le-*

Legions of Angels? But how then ſhall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it muſt be? 26 *Matth.* 43.54. *And the cup which my Father has given me, ſhall I not drink it?* 18 *John* 11. But what is this now to us? our Saviour did not reſiſt the moſt *unjuſt* and *Tyrannical* powers, becauſe God had decreed he ſhould die by their hands, and he came into the world for this very purpoſe; but has God as peremptorily decreed, that we muſt ſuffer alſo by unjuſt violence? were we born for this very end, to ſuffer death by *Herods* and *Pontius Pilates*? to be the ſlaves and Vaſſals, the ſcorn and the Triumph of inſolent *Tyrants*? certainly God had a greater care and regard for Mankind than ſo: and then our caſe is very different from our Saviour's; and though he died patiently, we may defend our Lives, and our Liberties, which are as dear as our Lives, if we can.

2. And therefore they add, that Chriſt took upon himſelf the perſon not only of a private man, but of a ſervant, that he might make us free, and that not only as to our Spiritual, but as to our *Civil Liberties*, as the *Virgin Mary* ſings; *He hath ſhewed ſtrength with his arm, he hath ſcattered the proud in the imaginati-*

on

on of their heart: he hath put down the mighty from their ſeats, and hath exalted them of low degree, 1 *Luke* 51, 52. which they think, does not ſignifie that Chriſt has eſtabliſhed *Tyrants* in their *Thrones*, and ſubjected Chriſtians to the vileſt ſlavery. As Chriſt has taught us by his example to bear ſervitude and ſufferings with an equal mind, when we cannot help it; ſo he has not forbid us to vindicate and recover our *natural rights* and *liberties*, when we can, according to the expreſs direction of St. *Paul*, *Art thou called being a ſervant? care not for it: but if thou mayeſt be made free, uſe it rather. Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the ſervants of men*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 21, 23.

Now in anſwer to this, we may conſider in general, that if all this proves any thing, it proves, that *Chriſt* did not intend, that his ſufferings ſhould be an example to us: and yet St. *Peter* expreſly tells us, that he did; *Chriſt alſo ſuffered for us, leaving us an example, that we ſhould follow his ſteps:* & wherein we muſt imitate Chriſt in ſuffering, he tells us in the ſame place, *viz. in ſuffering wrongfully, in taking it patiently, when we do well, and ſuffer for it*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 19, 20, 21.

And

And I think St. *Peter's* Authority in this caſe is better then all the Arguments that can be urged againſt it; and therefore whether we could anſwer theſe Arguments or no, yet it is evident, that they are not good, becauſe they prove that which is manifeſtly falſe, that Chriſt is not our Example in ſuffering, when St. *Peter* tells us, that he is: but yet it is a mighty ſatisfaction, not only to know, that an Argument is falſe, but to diſcover, wherein the fallacy conſiſts; and therefore I ſhall give a more particular anſwer to theſe objections.

1. As for their firſt Argument, that *Chriſt* came into the world on purpoſe to die as a ſacrifice for ſin, and therefore it was inconſiſtent with his deſign, and the perſon he undertook, to reſiſt and oppoſe, had it been never ſo lawful to reſiſt; I grant it is very true, but yet this does not prove, that he cannot be our example in ſuffering. For,

1. This is not the only reaſon our Saviour gives of his *Non-reſiſtance*, and patient ſuffering. He gives *Peter* another reaſon, Becauſe it is unlawful to draw the Sword againſt a juſt Authority, though our cauſe be never ſo juſt: *Put up thy Sword again into his place, for*

all

all they that take the ſword ſhall periſh by the ſword; which I have already explained to you at large. So that our Saviour acknowledges it as unlawful to reſiſt a lawful Authority, as it was inconſiſtent with his deſign of dying for the ſins of men; and herein certainly he is fit to be our example, in not reſiſting a lawful Authority in his own defence.

2. I grant, it had not been agreeable to the *Perſon* which our Saviour took, to have avoided death by a forcible reſiſtance; but then our Saviour voluntarily took ſuch a Perſon, as was fit to be an example to us. His *Perſon* and his *Religion* were very well ſuited to each other; a meek, humble, ſuffering *perſon*, to be an example of a meek, humble and ſuffering *Religion*. His *perſon* and external circumſtances of his appearance were on purpoſe fitted to his *Religion*; and it is none of the leaſt wonders of the Divine wiſdom, that the work of our redemption was accompliſht in ſuch a *myſterious way*, as at once made our Saviour the Author of our redemption, and an example of all the graces and vertues of the Chriſtian life.

Might not theſe men, if they pleaſed, by the ſame Argument prove, that Chriſt

Christ is not to be our example in meekness and poverty, and contempt of this world, and forgiving enemies, &c. because he came into the world on this design, *not to be ministred unto, but to minister?* He chose a mean and low fortune; and all the affronts and indignities he suffered, were part of his voluntary *humiliation*, and therefore it became him to bear them patiently, and to forgive them, as much as it did to die patiently by wicked hands; but there is not the same reason for us to do so: and thus it will be hard to find any thing, wherein Christ is to be our example, because the very reason of his coming into the world, the manner and circumstances of his appearance, all that he did and suffered, may be resolved into the decree and appointment of God, and his voluntary undertaking, and the accomplishment of ancient *Types* and *Prophecies*; and therefore he is no more to be an example to us, than a man who acts the part of a *beggar* or of a *Prince*, is to be an example to all that see him.

But methinks it is worth considering, why *Christ* chose such a person as this. Why he was born of mean and obscure parents, and chose a poor and industrious life,

life, and an accurſed and infamous death? was it impoſſible for *infinite wiſdom* to have laid a more glorious and triumphant ſcene of our redemption? was there no poſſible way, but the condeſcenſion and ſufferings of his own Son? Let thoſe ſay that, who dare venture to determine, what infinite wiſdom can do. It is enough for me to know, that Chriſt took ſuch a mean and ſuffering perſon upon him, becauſe it was moſt agreeable to the Religion, which he preacht, and of which he was to be an example; and therefore though Chriſt ſuffered for other reaſons, and to other ends and purpoſes, than we do or can ſuffer, yet his ſufferings are an example to us, becauſe God choſe to ſave and redeem us by the ſufferings of his Son, not only that he might expiate our ſins by his blood, but alſo that he might be an example to us of meekneſs, and patience, and ſubmiſſion to the Divine will, and ſubjection to government, even in the moſt unjuſt and infamous ſufferings.

3. We may conſider further, that *Chriſt's* ſuffering in obedience to the will and appointment of God, does not make him unfit to be our example. For

though God has not ſo peremptorily decreed, that all Chriſtians ſhould ſuffer, as he did that Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, yet whenever we are called forth to ſuffer, (as we always are, when we cannot avoid ſuffering without reſiſting a lawful Authority) our ſufferings are as much the effects of God's decree and appointment, as the ſufferings of Chriſt were; and in ſuch caſes every *Chriſtian* may, and ought to ſay, as his Lord did, *The Cup which my Father hath given me ſhall I not drink it?* Thus St. *Peter* expreſly tells the *Chriſtians* to whom he wrote, and gives it as a reaſon, why they ſhould ſuffer patiently, *even for doing well. For even hereunto were you called, becauſe Chriſt alſo ſuffered for us, leaving us an example, that we ſhould follow his ſteps*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. Now *calling* in the *New Teſtament* ſignifies the *choice* and *election* of *God*, and always ſuppoſes a divine *decree*, *appointment*, and *conſtitution*, as the foundation of it. Thus St. *Paul* tells us, that the gifts and calling (κλῆσις) of God are without repentance, 11 *Rom.* 29. that is, that decree he made to chooſe the poſterity of *Abraham* for his people, which ſtill intitled all thoſe of them to the bleſſings of the Goſpel, who would believe

lieve in *Chriſt.* Thus the ſtate of Chriſtianity is our calling, and holy calling, 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. 3 *Heb.* 1. becauſe it is the *way* and *means* God hath choſen and appointed for the Salvation of Mankind: and Chriſtians are often ſtiled the *Called,* becauſe God has now decreed to chuſe all the ſincere Diſciples of Chriſt, as he formerly did the poſterity of *Abraham,* to be his peculiar people; and throughout the Scriptures of the New Teſtament, God is never ſaid to *call,* nor any one to be *called of God,* but with reſpect to ſome divine *decree* and *conſtitution*; and therefore when St. *Peter* tells the Chriſtians, that they are *called to ſuffer,* it ſignifies that God has appointed them to it, by his poſitive will and decree.

This St. *Paul* diſcourſes more at large in his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, and comforts them under their ſufferings from this very conſideration, that the ſufferings which they underwent, were not the effects of meer chance and accident, nor of the wickedneſs and injuſtice of men, nor barely of Gods permiſſion, but of his decree and appointment; and therefore they might certainly conclude, that what ever their ſufferings were, they ſhould turn to their good,

8 *Rom.*28, 29, 30. *And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them that are called according to his purpoſe,* τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς, *to thoſe who are called*, that is, to ſuffer, which is the argument the *Apoſtle* is diſcourſing of, according to his will and pleaſure and appointment.

Sufferings are not for the good of all profeſt Chriſtians, for they may tempt Hypocrites to renounce their Religion, and great and ſevere ſufferings may be too powerful a temptation for weak though ſincere Chriſtians; and therefore when the rage and malice of men boils and ſwells, God ſets bounds to it, and does not ſuffer theſe perſecutions and afflictions promiſcuouſly to light upon all Chriſtians, but exerciſeth a very particular providence in chuſing out fit perſons to ſuffer, in directing the ſtorm and tempeſt of Perſecution to fall where he pleaſes, upon ſuch Perſons, who are armed with faith and patience to reſiſt its fury, and to bear and conquer its rage. And ſuch perſons, who are thus appointed, who are thus *called* by God to ſuffer, ſhall be ſure to conquer, and to receive the reward of Conquerours. For thus the Apoſtle adds, *For whom he did*

did foreknow, he alſo did predeſtinate to be conformed to the Image of his Son, that he might be the firſt-born among many brethren. This conformity to the Image of Chriſt in this place, does plainly ſignifie a conformity to him in ſufferings, as is evident from the whole ſcope of the place. Some perſons it ſeems there are, whom God does predeſtinate or fore-appoint to be conformed to the ſufferings of Chriſt: for this is not the actual portion of all Chriſtians, though it is the condition of our Diſcipleſhip; and they are thoſe whom he did foreknow. Now the fore-knowledge of God includes his choice and election; he chuſes out of the body of Chriſtians, ſome fit perſons to make his Martyrs and Confeſſors, to be examples of Faith and Patience and Courage to the world. *And whom he did predeſtinate, them he alſo called; and whom he called, them he alſo juſtified; and whom he juſtified, them he alſo glorified*; that is, thoſe perſons whom God thus chuſes, and preordains to ſuffer as Chriſt did, in time he calls forth to ſuffer; and when he does ſo he *juſtifies* them, that is, he brings them off with triumph and victory, and owns and applauds their Faith and Patience. For

ſo δικαιοω ſometimes ſignifies; and therefore to be *juſtified*, is expounded by to conquer and overcome, 3 *Rom.*4. *That thou mighteſt be juſtified* (ἵνα δικαιωθῇς) *in thy ſayings, and mighteſt overcome when thou art judged.* And indeed this is properly to be *juſtified* in any trial or combate, to overcome and conquer; and that God who gives the victory, gives the reward too; and whom he *juſtifies*, them he alſo *glorifies*: which ſeems to refer not to thoſe rewards which are common to all Chriſtians, but to ſome peculiar degree of glory, which is prepared for ſuch Conquerours, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks; *If ſo be, that we ſuffer with him, that we may be alſo glorified together*, 17 *v.*

So that though God has not made us ſlaves and vaſſals to the humour of every Tyrant, yet all the afflictions and ſufferings of Chriſtians, eſpecially thoſe, which befal them on the account of Religion, are as particularly ordered and determined by God, as the ſufferings of Chriſt himſelf were: and therefore there is no difference upon this account between the ſufferings of Chriſt, and the ſufferings of his Diſciples; and therefore though Chriſt came into the world on purpoſe to ſuffer in obedience to the

Di-

Divine will, this does not make him ever the leſs fit to be an example to us. Nay, his obedience to the will of God in ſuffering the hardeſt things from the moſt unjuſt and Tyrannical powers, is an example to us of the ſame patient ſuffering, and ſubmiſſion to the will of God.

It is true, none of us in particular can know that God has decreed, that we ſhall ſuffer ſuch or ſuch things, and from ſuch or ſuch hands, as our Saviour did; but yet this we know, that it is God's will and pleaſure, that we ſhould patiently endure thoſe ſufferings, which we cannot avoid without ſin; and ſince he has forbid us by expreſs Laws to reſiſt the higher powers, whatever ſufferings cannot be avoided without reſiſtance, it is God's will and pleaſure, that we ſhould ſubmit to them. And ſince none of theſe ſufferings, which are unavoidable to us, befal us without the particular decree and appointment of God, we have reaſon in imitation of our great Maſter, to ſubmit to them with the ſame cheerfulneſs and ſelf-reſignation as he did.

There is ſomething indeed in the example of our Saviour, which in our

circumstances we are not bound to imitate. For he punctually knowing, what God's will and pleasure was concerning him, voluntarily chose that condition, which he so well knew, God had allotted for him. He freely chose a mean and servile fortune, he chose suffering and death; when his time of offering up himself was come, he went up to *Jerusalem* on purpose to die there: but we are not bound to choose poverty and disgrace and suffering, we are not bound voluntarily to deliver up our selves into the hands of *Tyrants* and *Persecutours*, who thirst after our Blood. We may and ought to use all just and honest arts to make our condition easie and comfortable in the world, and to avoid the rage and fury of bloody men, because we cannot tell, that it is the will and appointment of God, that we shall suffer, till our sufferings are unavoidable: and then when we must either suffer or sin, when we must either renounce our Religion, or resist the powers, we must embrace suffering and death, as that portion, which God has allotted for us.

I shall onely observe, by the way, what a mighty security this is to all good Christians, how *absolute* or *tyrannical*

nical ſoever the power be under which they live; that they are ſafe in God's hands, and all the Powers of men and Devils cannot touch them, till God by a poſitive decree appoints and orders their ſuffering. There could not be greater nor more abſolute *Tyrants* than the *Roman Emperours* were at this time, and yet they had no power over the meaneſt Chriſtian, but by an expreſs commiſſion from Heaven. This is the ſpecial priviledge of the Chriſtian Church above the reſt of mankind, that they are God's peculiar care and charge; that he does not permit any ſufferings or perſecutions to befal them, but what he himſelf orders and appoints. It is a great ſecurity to the World, that there is no evil happens to men but what God permits, and that he permits nothing but what he can over-rule to wiſe and good ends; but it is a greater happineſs to have our condition immediately allotted by God. God may permit a great many evils to befal us in anger and diſpleaſure; but when he takes us into his immediate protection, and under his own government, whatever evils he appoints for us, whoever are the inſtruments of them, are certainly

tainly for our good: and therefore there is no ſuch danger in the Doctrine of *Non-reſiſtance*, as ſome men imagine. How *abſolute* ſoever this may be thought to render *Princes*, ſincere Chriſtians can ſuffer nothing by it: for they ſhall ſuffer nothing, more nor leſs, than what God appoints for them to ſuffer.

2. It is alſo urged againſt the obligation of our Saviour's example to ſuffer as he did, that Chriſt by his ſtate of ſervitude and ſufferings, has purchas'd liberty for us; and that not onely a ſpiritual and internal, but an external and civil liberty. We are no longer bound to ſubmit to *uſurping* and *tyrannical* powers, when we have ſtrength and power to deliver our ſelves from that neceſſity. There is no help for it, but men who are weak and unable to reſiſt, muſt obey and ſuffer; but this is matter of force, not of duty: We are now bought with a price, and therefore muſt not chuſe a ſtate of ſubjection and ſervitude to men.

1. Now in anſwer to this, we may conſider firſt, that this obedience and ſubjection to *Soveraign Princes*, either was a duty before Chriſt's appearing in the world, or it was not. If it were not,

not, then our deliverance from this ſubjection to *Princes*, is no part of that liberty which Chriſt has purchas'd for us, becauſe it was the natural right of mankind before; and therefore there was no need of Chriſt's dying to purchaſe this, which he cannot give us a greater right to than we had before his death. If ſubjection and *Non-reſiſtance* were our duty before, and ceaſes to be our duty now, then Chriſt by his death has cancelled the obligations of our duty, and purchas'd a liberty and freedom not to do that now which by the Laws of God or Nature we were bound to do before; that is, Chriſt by his death has abrogated not onely the Ceremonial, but ſome Moral Laws; which I ſhew'd you before was contrary to the nature and deſigne of his undertaking.

2. It is ſtrangely unaccountable, how obedience to any Law ſhould abrogate and cancel it. How Chriſt by ſubjection to the higher powers, ſhould for ever after deliver his Diſciples from the neceſſity of ſubjection, and make them free from the authority and government of *Princes*, whenever they diſlike their government. A typical Law may be fulfilled and receive its juſt accompliſhment,

pliſhment, and then its obligation ceaſes. Thus the death of Chriſt fulfilled the Levitical ſacrifices, and put an end to them: But the authority of a moral Law is confirmed and ſtrengthened, not abrogated and diſanulled by great examples. When Chriſt quietly and patiently ſubmitted to the moſt unjuſt ſentence, in obedience to lawful authoritie, he either did well or ill in it: If he did ill, his example indeed is not to be imitated; but if he did well, how did his doing well deliver us from the obligation of doing well? Did his doing well, make it ill for us to do as he did? Why did not his perfect and unſinning obedience as well deliver us from the obligation of all the other Laws of God, as from obedience and ſubjection to *Princes?*

The *Antinomians* indeed are ſo abſurd as to ſay, that Chriſt fulfilled all righteouſneſs in our ſtead, and that every believer has fulfilled the Law in Chriſt; and therefore is not bound to fulfil it in his own perſon as a condition of life and ſalvation. But yet they are not ſo abſurd as to ſay that Chriſt by the righteouſneſs of his life and death, has altered the nature of good and evil, and cancelled

celled any one Law of God. The Law is in force ſtill, and the dutie is the ſame; but the Law cannot take hold of them, nor exact a perſonal righteouſneſs from them, becauſe they have already fulfilled the Law in Chriſt. But now theſe men muſt ſay, that Chriſt has not onely fulfilled the Law of *ſubjection* and *non-reſiſtance*, as a condition of ſalvation, but has cancelled it as a rule of life.

3. The death of Chriſt could not purchaſe any civil rights or liberties which we had not before, nor make any change in the external fortunes or conditions of men. The death of Chriſt is repreſented in Scripture either as an atonement or expiation of ſin, or as the purchaſe and ſeal of the new Covenant. Now how does the death of Chriſt, by expiating our ſins, deliver us from ſubjection to our civil Governours? What connexion is there between the expiation of our ſins, and our freedom from the authoritie of Princes, that he who does one, muſt be ſuppoſed to do the other?

And as for the new Covenant, where does that grant any new franchiſes and liberties to ſubjects? Let them produce their new Charter to juſtifie their exemption

emption from ſubjection to *Princes*; let them ſhew any one ſaying in the Goſpel of our Saviour, if they can, to that purpoſe. What the Doctrine of Chriſt is, you have already heard; and when Chriſt died to confirm the new Covenant in his bloud, it is abſurd to ſay that he has purchaſed any liberties for us, but what he has expreſly granted to us in his Goſpel.

He does indeed promiſe libertie & freedom to his ſubjects, but it is a libertie of another nature; a libertie from the power and dominion of ſin. *Ye ſhall know the truth, and the truth ſhall make you free,* 8 John 32. that is, the power of the Goſpel-revelation ſhould deliver them from the Empire of their luſts, and give them the true government and maſterie of themſelves: And therefore he adds, *Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, Whoſoever committeth ſin, is the ſervant of ſin. And the ſervant abideth not in the houſe for ever: but the ſon abideth for ever. If the ſon therefore ſhall make you free, ye ſhall be free indeed,* 34,35,36 v.

But does not St. *Paul* adviſe the Corinthians to aſſert even their civil and political freedom when they can, and that from this argument, that they are the

the freemen of Chriſt? which ſeems to intimate, that there is ſuch a connexion between our ſpiritual and civil Liberties, that it does not become Chriſt's freemen to be ſlaves and ſervants unto men. 1 Cor. 7. 21, 22, 23 v. *Art thou called, being a ſervant? care not for it: but if thou mayeſt be made free, uſe it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a ſervant, is the Lord's free man: likewiſe alſo he that is called, being free, is Chriſt's ſervant. Ye are bought with a price, be not the ſervants of men.*

But what is it they would prove from theſe words? that our ſubjection to men is inconſiſtent with our freedom in Chriſt? that the Apoſtle expreſly denies. *For he that is a ſervant, is Chriſt's freeman.* Or that Chriſt, when he made us free, did deliver us from the ſubjection of men? not that neither. For he does not adviſe Chriſtian ſervants to leave their maſters, as he might and ought to have done, if Chriſt had beſtowed this civil libertie on them; but he was ſo far from this, that when *Oneſimus* had run away from his Maſter *Philemon*, and was converted by St. *Paul*, and proved very uſeful and ſerviceable in the miniſtrie, yet he would not detain

tain him from his Maſter, without asking his leave: which occaſioned the Epiſtle to *Philemon*, as you may ſee 10, 11, 12, &c. And in this place he adviſes the Chriſtian ſervants not to be concerned at their being ſervants; which was no injury at all to their Chriſtian libertie: But if they could procure their libertie by any fair and juſt means, they ſhould chuſe to do it; which is upon many accounts more deſirable, eſpecially when Chriſtians were ſervants to heathen Maſters, as it often was in thoſe days.

But does not the Apoſtle expreſly tell them, Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the ſervants of men? Yes, he does: but ſure this cannot ſignifie that ſervants ſhould caſt off the authoritie of their Maſters. For that is directly contrary to what he had adviſed them before, and contrary to his own practice in the caſe of *Oneſimus*, whom he ſent back to his Maſter *Philemon*. But all that I underſtand by it, is this; that thoſe Chriſtian ſervants who could not obtain their freedom, ſhould yet take care not to be ſervants to the luſts and paſſions of their Heathen Maſters. For though a ſtate of civil bondage and ſlavery

ſlavery is not inconſiſtent with their Chriſtian libertie, yet to be miniſters and ſervants to the vices of men, is: And therefore when they lay under any ſuch temptation (as Chriſtians who ſerved Heathen Maſters could not long eſcape it) they muſt then remember that they are Chriſt's freemen, who were bought with a price; and therefore muſt neither be ſervants to their own luſts, nor to the luſts of other men. And the reaſon why I chuſe this ſence of the words, is this; becauſe the *Apoſtle* oppoſes being bought with a price, that is, their being redeemed by Chriſt, or being Chriſt's freemen, to their being the ſervants of men, as inconſiſtent with each other. And therefore their being the ſervants of men, cannot be underſtood of civil ſervitude, which he before had told them was not inconſiſtent with their Chriſtian libertie, but of being ſervants to the vices of men.

But what now is all this to ſubjection to *Soveraign Princes*? Does the Apoſtle exhort the Chriſtians too to throw off the civil powers? It was poſſible for a Chriſtian ſervant to purchaſe his libertie, or to obtain it ſome other lawful ways; but how can ſubjects deliver themſelves

from the authoritie of Princes? unleſs they go into ſome Country where there is no government, or reſiſt and rebel againſt the higher powers where they are: Neither of which is agreeable to our Apoſtles Doctrine, who would not allow ſervants to run away from their Maſters, much leſs rebel againſt them to procure their libertie.

Nor was the caſe the ſame between Chriſtian ſubjects and ſoveraign Princes, and between Maſters and Servants; and therefore neither is the reaſon the ſame, why ſubjects ſhould deſire freedom from the higher powers. Servants in thoſe days were ſlaves and vaſſals, and were kept in ſuch conſtant attendance on their Maſters, that it muſt needs be very difficult; beſides the other temptations they were expoſed to, to gain any time or libertie for attending on Chriſtian Worſhip, and the inſtructions of the Church. But Chriſtian ſubjects are more at their own diſpoſal, even under *Heathen Princes*; and have all that libertie, excepting the caſe of perſecution, which is neceſſary for the purpoſes of Religion; which yet is the onely reaſon intimated here, why the Apoſtle adviſes ſervants to procure their freedom, if they can. To

To conclude this Argument; there were a ſort of men, even in the Apoſtles days, who boaſted mightily of their Chriſtian libertie, and thought ſcorn for a Chriſtian either to be a ſervant or a ſubject. For this reaſon St. *Paul* in this place inſtructs ſervants, that their Chriſtian libertie is not injured by their being ſervants: for this reaſon are there ſuch frequent directions to ſervants to obey their Maſters. For this reaſon does St. *Peter* caution the Chriſtians againſt this pretence of Chriſtian libertie, which ſome abuſed then, as they do ſtill, to the diſturbance of civil governments; *As free, but not uſing your liberty for a cloak of maliciouſneſs, but as the ſervants of God.*

CHAP. IV.

*What St.*Paul *Preached about Non-reſiſtance of the* Higher Powers.

HAving thus concluded what the Doctrine and Example of our Saviour was, about ſubjection to the higher powers; let us now conſider the Doctrine and Example of his Apoſtles. Not as if the Authority and Example of our Saviour were not ſufficient of it ſelf to make a Law, but ſtood in need of the confirmation and additional authority of his own Apoſtles; but we might juſtly ſuſpect our ſelves miſtaken in the meaning of our Saviour's words, or in the intention and deſign of his ſufferings, had none of his Apoſtles, who were immediately inſtructed by himſelf, and acquainted with the moſt ſecret myſteries of his Kingdom, ever preacht any ſuch Doctrine as this, of *Subjection* to *Princes*. And therefore to give you the more abundant aſſurance of this, I ſhall plainly ſhew you, that the Apoſtles taught the ſame Doctrine, and imitated the example of their great Maſter. I

I ſhall begin with St *Paul*, who has as fully declared himſelf in this matter, as it is poſſible any man can do by words, 13 Rom. 1, 2. *Let every Soul be ſubject unto the higher Powers; for there is no power but of God: the Powers that be, are ordained of God Whoſoever therefore reſiſteth the power, reſiſteth the ordinance of God; and they that reſiſt, ſhall receive to themſelves damnation.*

This is a very expreſs Teſtimony againſt Reſiſtance, and therefore I ſhall conſider it at large; for there have been various Arts uſed to pervert every word of it, and to make this Text ſpeak quite contrary to the deſign and intention of the Apoſtle in it: and therefore I ſhall divide the words into three general parts.

1. The Doctrine, the Apoſtle inſtructs them in: *Let every Soul be ſubject to the higher powers.* 2. The reaſon whereby he proves and inforces this Doctrine: *For there is no power but of God; the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whoſoever therefore reſiſteth the power, reſiſteth the ordinance of God.* 3. The puniſhment of ſuch reſiſtance: *And they that reſiſt, ſhall receive to themſelves damnation.*

1. I shall begin with the Doctrine, *That every Soul must be subject to the higher powers.* And here are three things to to be explained. 1. Who are contained under this general expression of *every Soul.* 2. Who are meant by *the higher powers.* 3. What is meant by being *subject.*

1. Who are contained under this general expression of *every Soul,* πᾶσα ψυχὴ. which by an ordinary Hebraism, signifies every man. For man is a compounded Creature of Body and Soul, and either part of him is very often in Scripture put for the whole. Sometimes Flesh, and sometimes Soul signifies the man; and when *every Soul* is opposed to the *higher powers,* it must signifie all men, of what rank or condition soever they be, who are not invested with this higher power. *Popes* and *Bishops* and *Priests,* as well *Spiritual* as *Secular persons*; the whole body of the People, as well as every single individual. For when *every Soul* is commanded to be subject, without any exception or limitation, this must reach them in all capacities and conditions.

The design of the Apostle, as you shall hear more presently, was to forbid all re-

reſiſtance of *Soveraign Princes*; and had he known of any men, or number of men, who might lawfully reſiſt, he ought not to have expreſt it in ſuch general terms, as to forbid all without exception. Had St. *Paul* known the Prerogative of St. *Peter*, and his Succeſſors the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, would he have written to the Chriſtians of *Rome* to be ſubject to their *Emperours*, without making any proviſion for the greater Authority of their *Biſhops*?

The reaſon he aſſigns why every Soul muſt be ſubject to the *higher Powers*, is, *becauſe all powers are of God*. So that whoever is bound to be ſubject to God, muſt be ſubject to their *Prince*, who is in God's ſtead. And this I think will reach the *Pope of Rome*, as well as any private Chriſtian; unleſs he will pretend to more authority on earth, than God himſelf has: for the *Prince* has God's Authority, and therefore cannot be reſiſted, but by a greater Authority than God's. And by the ſame reaſon, if the whole body of the people be ſubject to God, they muſt be ſubject to their *Prince* too, becauſe he acts by God's Authority and Commiſſion. Were a Soveraign *Prince* the Peoples Creature,

might be a good Maxime, *Rex major ſingulis, ſed minor univerſis*, that the King is greater than any particular Subject, but leſs than All together; but if he be God's Miniſter, he is upon that account as much greater than all, as God is.

And that the whole body of the people, all together, as well as one by one, are equally concerned in this command of being ſubject to the *higher Powers*, is evident from this conſideration, that nothing leſs than this will ſecure the peace and tranquillity of humane Societies. The reſiſtance of ſingle perſons is more dangerous to themſelves than to the Prince, but a powerful combination of Rebels is formidable to the moſt puiſſant Monarchs. The greater numbers of Subjects rebel againſt their Prince, the more do they diſtreſs his Government, and threaten his Crown and Dignity: and if his Perſon and Authority be Sacred, the greater the violence is, which is offered to him, the greater is the crime.

Had the Apoſtle exhorted the *Romans* after this manner: Let no private and ſingle man be ſo fooliſh, as to rebel againſt his *Prince*, who will be too ſtrong for him: but if you can raiſe ſufficient

forces

forces to oppoſe againſt him, if you can all conſent to Depoſe or Murder him, this is very innocent and juſtifiable, nay an Heroical Atchievement, which becomes a free-born people: How would this ſecure the peace and quiet of the world? how would this have agreed with what follows, that *Princes* are advanced by God, and that to reſiſt our *Prince*, is to reſiſt the Ordinance of God, and that ſuch men ſhall be ſeverely puniſht for it in this world or the next? for can the Apoſtle be thought abſolutely to condemn reſiſtance, if he makes it only unlawful to reſiſt when we want power to conquer? Which yet is all that can be made of it, if by every Soul the Apoſtle means only particular men, not the united force and power of Subjects.

Nor can there be any reaſon aſſigned, why the Apoſtle ſhould lay ſo ſtrict a command on particular Chriſtians to be ſubject to the higher Powers, which does not equally concern whole Nations. For if it can ever be lawful for a *whole Nation* to reſiſt a *Prince*, it may in the ſame circumſtances be equally lawful for a particular man to do it: if a Nation may conſpire againſt a *Prince*, who invades

vades their Rights, their Liberties, or their Religion, why may not any man by the ſame reaſon reſiſt a *Prince*, when his Rights and Liberties are invaded? It is not ſo ſafe and prudent indeed for a private man to reſiſt, as for great and powerful numbers; but this makes reſiſtance only a matter of diſcretion, not of Conſcience: if it be lawful for the whole body of a Nation to reſiſt in ſuch caſes, it muſt be equally lawful for a particular man to do it; but he does it at his own peril, when he has only his one ſingle force to oppoſe againſt his *Prince*. So that our Apoſtle muſt forbid reſiſtance in all or none. For ſingle perſons do not uſe to reſiſt or rebel, or there is no great danger to the *Publick* if they do; but the Authority of *Princes*, and the ſecurity of publick Government, is only endangered by a combination of *Rebels*, when the whole Nation or any conſiderable part for numbers, power, and intereſt, take Arms againſt their Prince. If reſiſtance of our Prince be a ſin, it is not the leſs, but the greater ſin, the greater and the more formidable the reſiſtance is; and it would very much unbecome the gravity and ſacredneſs of an Apoſtolical precept,

cept, to enjoyn ſubjection to private Chriſtians, who dare not, who cannot reſiſt alone; but to leave a powerful combination of Rebels at liberty to reſiſt. So that *every Soul* muſt ſignifie *all Subjects* whether ſingle or united: for whatever is unlawful for every ſingle Perſon conſidered as a Subject is unlawful for them all together; for the whole Nation is as much a ſubject to the *higher powers*, as any ſingle man. Thus I am ſure it is in our Government, where *Lords* and *Commons* aſſembled in *Parliament* own themſelves the Subjects of the *King*, and have by publick Laws diſclaimed all power of raiſing any *War* either *offenſive* or *defenſive againſt the King*.

2. Let us now conſider what is meant by the higher powers, [ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις] which ſignifies the ſupreme power in any Nation, in whomſoever it is placed. Whether in the *King*, as in *Monarchical governments*; or in the *Nobles*, as in *Ariſtocratical*; or in the *People*, as in *Democracies*. At the time of writing this Epiſtle, the ſupreme power was in the *Roman Emperours*; and therefore when St. *Paul* commands the Roman Chriſtians to be ſubject to the *higher powers*, the plain meaning is, that they ſhould

be subject to the *Roman Emperour*. And thus St. *Peter* explains it, 1 *Epist.* 2 *Chap.* 13 *v.* Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether to the *King* as supreme, ὡς ὑπερέχοντι, the word used in my *Text*, as to him who hath a supereminent power, and is above all others.

It is absolutely necessary in all well-governed Societies, that there should be some supreme and soveraign Power, from whence there lies no appeal, and which cannot and must not be resisted. For otherwise there can be no end of disputes, and controversies; men may quarrel eternally about rights and priviledges, and properties, and preheminencies; and when every man is Judge in his own cause, it is great oddes but he will give Judgement for himself, and then there can be no way to determine such matters, but by force and power. Which turns humane societies into a state of War, and no man is secure any longer, than he happens to be on the prevailing side.

Whoever considers the nature and the end of Government, must acknowledge the necessity of a supreme power, to decide controversies, to administer Justice, and

and to ſecure the Publick Peace: and it is a ridiculous thing to talk of a ſupreme power, which is not *unaccountable and irreſiſtible. For whatever* power is liable to be called to an account, and to be reſiſted, has ſome power above it, and ſo is not ſupreme.

Of late years, whoever has been ſo hardy, as to aſſert the Doctrine of *Nonreſiſtance*, has been thought an Enemy to his Country, one who tramples on all Laws, who betraies the rights and liberties of the ſubject, and ſets up for Tyranny and Arbitrary power. Now I would deſire thoſe men, who think thus, to try their skill in framing any model of government, which ſhall anſwer the ends and neceſſities of humane ſociety, without a ſupreme power, that is, without ſuch a power, as is abſolute and unaccountable.

If there be no ſupreme power in any ſociety, when ever there happens any difference among the members of ſuch a ſociety, nothing can be done; and ſuch a ſociety is an arbitrary and voluntary, not a governed ſociety; becauſe there is no body to govern, and no body to be governed: they may govern themſelves by mutual conſent; but if they cannot agree,

agree, there is an end of their government.

Where there is any government, there muſt be ſome-body to govern, and whoever has the power of government, muſt not be contradicted or reſiſted, for then he cannot govern; for a power to govern men onely when, and in what caſes they pleaſe to be governed, is no power. Now place this power where you will, in a ſingle Perſon, or in the hands of ſome ſelect perſons, or in the people, and the caſe is the ſame; wherever the power reſts, there it is abſolute and unaccountable: wherever there is any government, there muſt be a laſt appeal, and where the laſt appeal is, whether to a *Prince*, to a *Parliament*, or to the *People*, there is ſoveraign and abſolute power, which cannot be reſiſted without a diſſolution of government, and returning to a ſtate of war; which is a direct contradiction to the firſt inſtitution of humane ſocieties, and therefore that which cannot be allowed by the fundamental conſtitutions of any ſociety.

The reſult of all in ſhort is this: 1. That in all civil governments, there muſt be ſome ſupreme and ſoveraign power. 2. That the very notion of ſupreme

ſupreme power is, that it is unaccountable and irreſiſtible. And therefore, 3. whatever power in any nation according to the fundamental laws of its government, cannot and ought not to be reſiſted, that is the ſupreme power of that nation, the higher powers to which the Apoſtle requires us to be ſubject. And from hence it is evident, that the *Crown of England is an Imperial Crown*, and has all the rights of Soveraignty belonging to it. Since according to the fundamental Laws of the Realm, the *Perſon* and *Authority* of the *King* is ſacred and irreſiſtible. The *Oaths* of *Allegiance* and *Supremacy*, thoſe Laws which declare and acknowledge the *King* to be ſupreme in his Dominions under God, to have the ſole power of the Sword, that it is Treaſon to levy War againſt the *King* within the *Realm*, and without; That both or either *Houſes* of *Parliament* cannot, nor lawfully may, *raiſe* or *levy war offenſive* or *defenſive* againſt his *Majeſty*, his *Heirs*, or *lawful Succeſſors*; That it is not lawful upon any pretence whatſoever to take Arms againſt the *King*, and that we muſt abhor that traiterous poſition of taking arms by his authority againſt his *Perſon*, or againſt thoſe who

who are commiſſionated by him: Theſe, I ſay, and ſuch like declarations as theſe, both formerly and of late, made by both *Houſes of Parliament*, and enacted into publick laws, are a ſufficient proof, that the ſupreme power of theſe Realms is lodged in the *Prince*. For he who is unaccountable and irreſiſtible is ſupreme.

But to avoid all this, there are ſome who tell us, that by the higher powers in the Text, the Apoſtle means the Law. For laws are the higheſt and moſt venerable authority in any Nation; and we ought indeed to be ſubject to *Princes* who themſelves are ſubject to the Laws, which they are as much obliged to by virtue of this Apoſtolical command as meaner Perſons. For the law is as much ſuperior to them, as they are to their own ſubjects; and therefore when *Princes* violate publick laws, they are no longer to own them for the *Higher Powers*, but may vindicate the laws againſt them, may defend the legal authority of their *Prince* againſt his Perſonal uſurpations, may fight for the Authority of the *King* againſt his *Perſon*.

But in anſwer to this, we may conſider, 1. That it is evident from the whole context and manner of ſpeaking, that

that the Apoſtle does not here ſpeak of laws, but Perſons; not of Imperial laws, but ſoveraign Princes. Laws were never before called the *higher Powers*, neither in ſacred nor profane writers; ἐξουσία in the new Teſtament always ſignifies the authority of a Perſon, not of a law. And hence it ſignifies the Perſon inveſted with this authority. It were eaſy to prove this by numerous inſtances; but it will be ſufficient to ſhew, that thus it muſt ſignifie in the Text. Theſe are ſuch powers as are of God, appointed and ordained by God; which I ſuppoſe does not ſignifie the laws of every nation, many of which are far enough from being divine. They are expreſly called Rulers in the 3 *v.* and are the object of fear; which can puniſh and reward: *if thou wilt not be afraid of the power*, ἐξουσία, *do that which is good, and thou ſhalt have praiſe of the ſame.* Now I think no law, but the *Power*, which executes laws, can apply puniſhments or rewards according to mens deſerts: and in the 4 *v.* this very power is called the *Miniſter of God*, and ſaid to bear the ſword, which does not belong to laws but Perſons; and in the Text the Apoſtle ſpeaks of reſiſting

theſe powers, oppoſing force to force. Now though laws may be diſobeyed, it is onely lawgivers and Rulers, who are capable of reſiſtance.

2. But however, theſe higher Powers may ſignifie Princes and Rulers, as governing according to known laws. No, this cannot be neither, becauſe the Apoſtle ſpeaks of ſuch powers as were under the government of no laws; as it is ſufficiently known the *Roman Emperours* were not; their will was their law, and they made or repealed laws at their pleaſure. This Epiſtle was wrote either under *Claudius* or *Nero*; and I think I need not tell you, that neither of thoſe *Emperours* had any great Reverence for laws, and yet theſe were the higher powers to whom the Apoſtle commands them to be ſubject: and indeed, though there be a vaſt difference between a *Prince*, who by the fundamental Conſtitutions of his Kingdom, ought to govern by laws, and a *Prince* whoſe will is his law; yet no law can come into the notion and definition of ſupreme and ſoveraign Powers: ſuch a Prince is under the direction, but cannot properly be ſaid to be under the government of the law, becauſe there

is

is no ſuperior power to take cognizance of his breach of it; and a law has no authoritie to govern, where there is no power to puniſh. But I ſhall have occaſion to diſcourſe this more largely hereafter.

3. Let us now conſider, what is meant by being ſubject. Now ſubjection, according to its full latitude of ſignification, includes all thoſe duties, which we owe to ſoveraign Princes; a chearful and willing obedience to all their Juſt and lawful commands; an humble ſubmiſſion to their reproofs and Cenſures, Corrections and puniſhments; to honour and Reverence their Perſons and Authority; to pay cuſtom and tribute, and all legal taxes and impoſitions, as our Apoſtle addes, verſe the 7. *Render therefore unto all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due, cuſtom to whom cuſtom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour.* But the principal thing he has regard to in the text, is *Non-reſiſtance*, which is the onely perfect and abſolute ſubjection we owe to Princes. We are not always bound to do what they command, becauſe they may command, what we ought not, what we muſt not do; but we are always bound

to be ſubject, that is, never to reſiſt. Though a *Prince* abuſe his power, and oppreſs his ſubjects, we muſt not take upon us to right ourſelves, but muſt leave our cauſe to God, who is the great Protector of oppreſt Innocence: for as the Apoſtle tells us, He *that reſiſteth the power, reſiſteth the ordinance of God; and they that reſiſt*, &c. This is the doctrine the Apoſtle teaches, that *we muſt be ſubject to*, that is, that we muſt not reſiſt, nor rebel againſt *ſoveraign Princes*.

2. Let us then now conſider the reaſon, whereby the Apoſtle proves and inforces this doctrine of *ſubjection* or *Non-reſiſtance*. *For there is no power but of God; the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whoſoever therefore reſiſteth the power, reſiſteth the ordinance of God.* The plain meaning of which is this: That *ſoveraign Princes* are advanced to the Throne by God, and are his miniſters and vicegerents, inveſted with his authority and power to govern; and therefore when we reſiſt our *Prince*, we reſiſt the ordinance, conſtitution, and appointment of God. Such men do not reſiſt, rebel, or fight againſt man, but God. As he who reſiſts any ſub-

ordinate

ordinate Magiſtrates, reſiſts his Prince, from whom they receive their authority and commiſſion. And this is a very forcible Argument to *ſubjection* to *Princes:* for whatever our *Prince* be, it is certain, that God has an abſolute and uncontroulable right over us, as being the natural Lord and Governour of the world; and if Earthly *Princes* are plac't in the Throne by him, who is at liberty to put the Government of the world into what hands he pleaſes, who will dare to oppoſe God? or ask him, Why haſt thou done ſo? Whoever has any ſenſe of God's dominion and ſoveraignty, dares not rebel againſt him; and he, who believes that *Princes* are made by God, will no more dare to rebel againſt his *Prince*, than againſt God himſelf.

The *Patrons* of *reſiſtance* have uſed all manner of arts to evade the force of this *Text*, and to make the *Apoſtles* argument ſignifie juſt nothing; and therefore it will be neceſſary to conſider briefly what they ſay.

1. Then ſome of them own the truth of what St. *Paul* aſſerts, that *Soveraign Princes* are of God, are advanc't and ſet in their Thrones by him; but then they ſay, *Princes* are from God, no other-

Milton pro Pop. Angl. defenſio. p. 68.

wiſe than every thing elſe is of God. The divine Providence governs all things; and Plague and Peſtilence and Famine, and whatever evil and calamity befals a nation, is from God too; but does it hence follow, that when God brings any of theſe Judgements upon us, we muſt not Endeavour to remove them? No more, ſay they, does it follow, that we muſt not Endeavour to break the Yoak of a *Tyrant*, becauſe it was put on by God. That is, in plain Engliſh, that when the *Apoſtle* proves, that we muſt not reſiſt *Princes*, becauſe they are ſet up by God, he does not reaſon truly; for notwithſtanding this, we may reſiſt *Tyrannical Princes*, as we would do the *Plague*, though they are both ſent by God: and I ſuppoſe theſe men believe that St. *Paul* was no more inſpired by God, than *Princes* are made by him. Otherwiſe they might as eaſily have concluded, that ſince St. *Paul* founds no doctrine of *Non-reſiſtance* upon God's authority and dominion in advancing *Princes*, (and his argument muſt be good, if he were an inſpired man) that therefore there is ſome little difference between God's making a *King* though a *Tyrant*, and

his

his ſending the plague: and any man of an ordinary underſtanding might gueſs, that when God ſets up a *King* with a ſoveraign Power, he ſets him up to govern; and therefore though he may prove a ſcourge and a Plague, yet he is ſuch a Plague, as God will allow no man to remove, but himſelf. For it is a contradiction in the nature of the thing, to give authority to a *Prince* to govern, and to leave ſubjects at Liberty to reſiſt. *Tyrants* are God's miniſters, though they be but Executioners of his juſt vengeance; but an Executioner, though he be as dangerous as the Plague, cannot be reſiſted, without reſiſting the *Prince*.

2. At other times they tell us, that when St. *Paul* aſſerts, that *there is no power but of God, the powers that be, are ordained of God*, he means this onely of the Inſtitution of civil power and government, not of every *Prince* that is advanced to this power. The inſtitution of civil government they will allow to be from God, but they think it a reproach to God to own that *Tyrants* and oppreſſors, wicked and impious Kings, are advanced by God. His Providence many times, for wiſe reaſons,

permits this, as he does all other evils; but they cannot believe, that such men are advanc't by his council and approbation, and positive will and appointment. But this admits of various answers. For,

1. Can there be no wise reason given, why God may advance a bad man to be a *Prince?* If there may, then it is no reproach to the divine Providence. The natural end of humane societies is the preservation of Publick Peace and order; and this is in some measure attained even under the government of *Tyrants*. But God has a further end than this, to bless and reward a virtuous Nation, or to punish a loose and degenerate age; and there cannot be a greater blessing than a wise and virtuous *Prince*, nor a greater plague than a Merciless *Tyrant:* and therefore the Providence of God is as much concerned in setting a good or a bad *Prince* over any people, as in rewarding or punishing them. Upon this account, God calls the *King* of *Assyria the rod of his anger, whom he raised up for the punishment of an Hypocritical Nation,* 10 Isai. 5, 6.

2. I have already proved, that by the

the *Powers* in my *Text*, the *Apoſtle* means the perſons of *Soveraign Princes*; and therefore according to his Doctrine, thoſe *Princes* who were then in being, that is, the *Roman Emperors*, were advanc't by God; *the powers that be*, that is, the *Princes* and *Emperors* who now govern the world, are ordained and appointed by God. And that thus it is, God himſelf tells us, 27 Jerem. 5, 6. *I have made the Earth, and given it unto whom it ſeemed meet unto me: and now I have given all theſe lands into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon my ſervant.* Thus he called *Cyrus* by name, many years before he was born, *to be his ſhepherd, and to perform his pleaſure in rebuilding Jeruſalem*, 44 Iſa. 28. 45. ch. 1, 2, 3, 4.

This was the belief of the primitive Chriſtians under heathen and perſecuting *Emperors*. *Tertullian* who wrote his *Apologie* under *Severus*, aſſerts that *Cæſar* was choſen by God, and therefore that the Chriſtians had a peculiar *Propriety* in *Cæſar*, as being made *Emperor* by their God. *Sed quid ego amplius de religione atque Pietate chriſtiana in Imperatorem, quem neceſſe eſt ſuſpiciamus, ut eum quem Dominus noſter elegit, & merito*

rito dixerim, noſter eſt magis Cæſar, a Deo noſtro conſtitutus. Tert. Apol. cap. 33. and this he aſſigns as the reaſon, why they honour and reverence, and pray for him, and are in all things ſubject to him.

3. If theſe men will grant, the inſtitution of civil power and authority by God is a neceſſary reaſon why we muſt not reſiſt thoſe who have this power, it ſhall ſatisfie me; and I will diſpute no further, whether by *Powers* in the *Text* the *Apoſtle* means civil government, or the Perſons of *Princes*, ſo long as the Doctrine of *Non-reſiſtance* is ſecured: but if they will not grant this, then they muſt grant, that either the *Apoſtle* reaſons weakly, or that this is not the ſenſe of his words.

St. *Chryſoſtom* indeed by the *Powers* that be ordained of God, underſtands no more than that civil power and authority is from God, as being afraid to own that all *Princes*, though never ſo wicked are appointed by God; but then he owns the doctrine of *Non-reſiſtance*, becauſe the power is from God, whoever have the poſſeſſion of it, or however he came by it. But I think the argument for *Non-reſiſtance* is much ſtronger,

ſtronger, if we acknowledge, that *ſoveveraign Princes* themſelves are appointed by God, and have this power put into their hands by his peculiar and ordering Providence.

4. Others in plain terms deny, that this is true, that Princes receive their power from God, and are ordained and appointed by him, though the words of the Apoſtle are very plain and expreſs in the caſe.

But let us ſet aſide the Authority of the *Apoſtle* a while, and examine why they ſay ſo. And this they think is very plain in all Nations, that *Princes* are advanc't to the Throne by the choice and conſent of the *People*, or by *right* of *inheritance*, confirmed and ſettled by *publick Laws*, which include the conſent of the *People*, and therefore they receive their power from thoſe who choſe them; which is no more than a *Fiduciary power*, which they are lyable to give an account of to thoſe who chooſe them.

Now grant this to be true, that *Princes* are advanc't to the Throne by the *People*, which will not very well hold in *conqueſts*, nor in *hereditary Kingdoms*; yet, I ſay, ſuppoſe it to be true, ſince

ſince it was manifeſtly the caſe of the *Roman Empire*, when the Apoſtle wrote this Epiſtle, their *Emperors* being choſen either by the *Senate* or the *Army*; yet I would deſire to be reſolved in ſome few plain queſtions.

1. Whether God does nothing, but what he does by an immediate power? Whether he cannot appoint and chooſe an *Emperor*, unleſs he does it by a *Voice* from Heaven, or ſends an *Angel* to ſet the Crown upon his head? Whether God cannot by a great many unknown ways, determine the choice of the *people*, to that *Perſon*, whom he has before choſen himſelf? May we not as well ſay, that God does nothing but miracles, becauſe every thing elſe has ſome viſible cauſe, and may be aſcribed either to natural or moral agents? God may chuſe an *Emperor*, and the *people* chuſe him too, and the *peoples* choice is onely the effect of *God's* choice; and therefore notwithſtanding all this, *Princes* owe their crowns and ſecepters to *God: the powers that be are ordained of God.*

2. How does it follow, that becauſe *Princes* are choſe by the people, therefore they derive their power from them, and are accountable to them? This is not

not true in humane governments. A City or any Corporation may have Authority to chooſe their Magiſtrates, and yet they do not derive their power from their fellow-Citizens, who choſe them, but from their *Prince*. Thus the *People* may chuſe, but God inveſts with power and Authority. For indeed, how can people, who have no power of Government themſelves, give that power, which they have not? God is the only governour of the world, and therefore there can be no power of Government, but what is derived from him. But theſe men think, that all civil authority is founded in conſent; as if there were no natural Lord of the world, or all mankind came free and independent into the world. This is a contradiction to what at other times they will grant, that the inſtitution of Civil power and Authority is from God; and indeed if it be not, I know not how any Prince can juſtifie the taking away the life of any man, whatever crime he has been guilty of. For no man has power of his own life, and therefore cannot give this power to another: which proves that the power of capital puniſhments cannot reſult from meer conſent, but from a

ſu-

superiour Authority, which is Lord of life and death.

If it be said, that every man has a natural right to defend his own life by taking away the life of any man who injuriously assaults him, and he may part with this power of self-defence to his *Prince*, and that includes the power of life and death: I answer,

1. Suppose the Laws of *Self-preservation* will justifie the taking away another man's life in preservation of our own, yet this is a *Personal right*, which *God* and *Nature* has given us; and unless we can prove, that we have Authority to make over this *right* to another, as well as to use it our selves, our consent cannot give Authority to the Magistrate to take away any man's life in our cause.

2. This natural right of self-defence cannot be the Original of the Magistrates power, because no man does give up this right. Every man has the right of *Self-preservation*, as intire under civil government, as he had in a state of Nature. Under what government soever I live, I may still kill another man, when I have no other way to preserve my own life from unjust violence by private hands

hands. And this is all the liberty any man had in a ſuppoſed ſtate of nature. So that the Magiſtrates power of the Sword is a very different thing from every man's right of ſelf-preſervation, and cannot owe its original to it. For,

3. The Magiſtrates power of the Sword is not meerly *defenſive*, as the right of ſelf-preſervation is, but *vindicative*, to execute vengeance on evil doers; which power no man has over his equals in a ſtate of Nature. For vengeance is an act of ſuperiority, and ſuppoſes the Authority of a Lord and Judge; and therefore the conſent of all Mankind cannot give the power and authority of a Sword to a *Prince*, becauſe they never had it themſelves. A *Prince*, as he bears the Sword, is not the peoples Officer, but the Miniſter of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil, as our Apoſtle adds, *v.* 4. and this is the true reaſon of our ſubjection. *Wherefore you muſt needs be ſubject, not only for wrath, but alſo for conſcience ſake.*

4. There is another objection againſt what the Apoſtle affirms, that *there is no power but of God; the powers that be, are ordained of God.* For is the power of victorious Rebels and Uſurpers from God?

God? did *Oliver Cromwell* receive his power from God? then it ſeems, it was unlawful to reſiſt him too, or to conſpire againſt him: then all thoſe Loyal Subjects, who refuſed to ſubmit to him, when he had got the power in his hands, were Rebels and Traitors.

To this I anſwer, that the moſt proſperous Rebel is not the *Higher Powers*, while our *natural Prince*, to whom we owe obedience and ſubjection, is in being. And therefore though ſuch men may get the power into their hands by Gods permiſſion, yet not by Gods Ordinance; and he who reſiſts them, does not reſiſt the Ordinance of God, but the uſurpations of men. In *Hereditary Kingdoms*, the *King* never dies, but the ſame minute that the natural Perſon of one *King* dies, the Crown deſcends upon the next of Blood; and therefore he who rebelleth againſt the Father, and murders him, continues a Rebel in the Reign of the Son, which commences with his Fathers death.

It is otherwiſe indeed, where none can pretend a greater right to the Crown, than the *uſurper*; for there poſſeſſion of power ſeems to give a right. Thus many of the *Roman Emperours* came to the

the Crown by very ill means, but when they were poſſeſt of it, they were the *Higher Powers*; for the Crown did not deſcend by *inheritance*, but ſometimes by the *Election* of the *Senate*, ſometimes of the *Army*, and ſometimes by *force* and *power*, which always draws a conſent after it. And therefore the *Apoſtle* does not direct the Chriſtians to enquire by what Title the Emperours held their Crowns, but commands them to ſubmit to thoſe, who had the power in their hands: for the poſſeſſion of Supream and Soveraign power is *Title* enough, when there is no better *Title* to oppoſe againſt it. For then we muſt preſume, that God gives him the irreſiſtible authority of a *King*, to whom he gives an irreſiſtible power; which is the only means, whereby *Monarchies* and *Empires* are transferred from one Nation to another. There are two Examples in Scripture which manifeſtly confirm what I have now ſaid.

The firſt in the Kingdom of *Iſrael*: after the ten Tribes had divided from the Houſe of *Judah*, and the Family of *David*, God had not entailed the Kingdom upon any certain Family; he had indeed by *Ahijah* the Prophet promiſed

after *Solomons* death ten Tribes to *Jeroboam* the Son of *Nebat*, 1 *Kings* 11. 29. *&c.* but had afterwards by the ſame Prophet threatned *Jeroboam*, to deſtroy his whole Family, *Chap.* 15. 10, 11. *Baaſha* fulfils this prophecy by the traiterous murder of *Nadab*, (who ſucceeded his Father *Jeroboam* in the Kingdom) and uſurpt the government himſelf, and ſlew all *Jeroboam's houſe*, 28, 29. *v.* This Murder and Treaſon is numbred among the ſins of *Baaſha*; for which God afterwards threatned to deſtroy his houſe, as he had done the houſe of *Jeroboam*, 16 *Chap. v.* 7. and yet he having uſurpt the Throne, and got the power into his hands, and no man having a better Title than his, God himſelf is ſaid to have exalted him out of the duſt, and made him *Prince* over his *People Iſrael*, *v.* 2. *Elah* ſucceeded *Baaſha*, who had no better Title than his Father; and yet *Zimri*, who ſlew him, is accuſed of Treaſon for it, *v* 20. *Zimri* uſurpt the Kingdom when he had ſlew his Maſter, but he was only a vain pretender to it, when he wanted power; for when the people who were encamped againſt *Gibbethon*, heard that *Zimri* had killed the King, they made *Omri* King, and went immediately

diately and beſieged *Tirzah*, where *Zimri* had taken poſſeſſion of the Kings Palace; who finding no way to eſcape, ſet fire to it himſelf, and died in the flames of it. And now *Iſrael* was divided between *Omri* and *Tibni*; but thoſe who followed *Omri* prevailed againſt thoſe who followed *Tibni*; and *Tibni* died, and *Omni* Reigned, *v.* 21, 22. All which plainly ſhews, that where there is no regular Succeſſion to the Kingdom, there poſſeſſion of power makes a King, who cannot afterwards be reſiſted and oppoſed without the guilt of treaſon: and this was the caſe of the *Roman Empire*, at the writing of this Epiſtle; and therefore the Apoſtle might well ſay, *That the powers that be, are ordained of God.* That whoever had the Supream power in his hands, is the higher power, that muſt not be reſiſted.

But it was otherwiſe in the Kingdom of *Judah*, which God himſelf had entailed on *Davids* Family, as appears from the example of *Joaſh*, who was concealed by his *Aunt Jehoſheba*, and hid in the houſe of the Lord for ſix years. During this time *Athaliah* reigned, and had the whole power of government in her hands; but yet this did not make

her a Soveraign and irreſiſtible *Prince*; becauſe *Joaſh* the Son of *Ahaziah*, the right Heir of the Crown, was yet alive. And therefore in the ſeventh year *Jehoiada* the Prieſt ſet *Joaſh* upon the Throne, and ſlew *Athaliah*, and was guilty of no Treaſon or Rebellion in doing ſo, 2 *Kings* 11. Which ſhews, that no uſurpations can extinguiſh the Right and Title of a natural *Prince*. Such Uſurpers, though they have the poſſeſſion of the ſupream power, yet they have no right to it; and though God for wiſe reaſons may ſometimes permit ſuch uſurpations, yet while his Providence ſecures the Perſons of ſuch depoſed and baniſhed Princes from violence, he ſecures their Title too. As it was in *Nebuchadnezzar's* viſion; *The tree is cut down, but the ſtump of the roots is left in the earth. The Kingdom ſhall be ſure to them, after that they ſhall know, that the Heavens do rule*, Dan. 4. 26.

3. The Apoſtle adds the puniſhment of thoſe, who reſiſt the *higher Powers: They that reſiſt, ſhall receive to themſelves damnation.* Where, by κρίμα judgment and damnation, it is plain the Apoſtle means the puniſhments of the other world. Proſperous Rebellions are not always puniſht in this world, but they are in the next.

next. And therefore we must be subject not only for wrath, for fear of men; but out of Conscience towards God, and a reverence of his righteous judgments.

The sum of all in short is this. That all men, whatever their rank and condition be; not only Secular, but Spiritual Persons; not only private men, but subordinate Magistrates; not only single men, but whole Bodies and Communities, the united force and power of a Nation, must be subject to *Soveraign Princes*; that is, must obey all their just and lawful commands, and patiently submit even to their unjust violence, without making any resistance, without opposing force to force, or taking Arms, though it be only in their own defence. For *Soveraign Princes* are made and advanced by God, who exerciseth a particular providence in the disposal of Crowns and Scepters, and over-ruleth all external and second causes, to set up such *Princes* as he himself has first chose; and therefore he that resisteth, resisteth not Man, but God; he opposeth the constitution and appointment of the Soverain Lord of the world, who alone is our natural Lord and Governour, and

who alone has right to put the government of the world into what hands he pleaſes; and how proſperous ſoever ſuch Rebels may be in this World, they ſhall not eſcape the Divine Vengeance and Juſtice, which will follow them into another world: *they ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation.*

This was St. *Paul*'s Doctrine about ſubjection to the *higher powers*; and he did not only preach this Doctrie himſelf, but he charges *Timothy* and *Titus*, two Biſhops whom he had ordained, the one *Biſhop* of *Epheſus*, the other of *Crete*, to preach the ſame.

Thus he charges *Titus*, to *put them in mind to be ſubject to Principalities and Powers, to obey Magiſtrates, to be ready to every good work*, 3 *Titus* 1. When he commands him to put them in mind to be ſubject, he ſuppoſes, that this is a known duty of the Chriſtian Religion, and a duty of ſuch great weight and moment, that people ought to be frequently minded of it; that the Biſhops and Miniſters of Religion ought frequently to preach of it, and to preſs and inculcate it upon their hearers. For it is a great ſcandal to the Chriſtian Religion, when this duty is not obſerved: and yet

in

in many caſes this duty is ſo hard to be obſerved,& requires ſuch a great degree of ſelf-denial and reſignation to the will of God, and contempt of preſent things, that too many men are apt to forget it, and to excuſe themſelves from it. And therefore St. *Paul* gives this in particular charge to *Titus*, and in him to all the Biſhops and Miniſters of the Goſpel, to take ſpecial care to inſtruct people well in this point, and frequently to renew and repeat their exhortations; eſpecially when they find a buſie, factious, and ſeditious ſpirit abroad in the world.

Thus he inſtructs *Timothy* the *Biſhop* of *Epheſus*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. *I exhort therefore, that firſt of all, ſupplications prayers, interceſſions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for Kings, and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godlineſs and honeſty.*

But you will ſay, What is this to ſuch an abſolute ſubjection to Princes as includes *Non-reſiſtance* in it? cannot we pray for any man, without making him our abſolute and Soverain Lord? are we not bound to pray for all our Enemies and Perſecutors? and does our praying for them, make it unlawful to reſiſt and

oppoſe their unjuſt violence? How then can you prove from the duty of praying for Kings, that it is in no caſe lawful to reſiſt them? if it were lawful to reſiſt *Tyrannical Princes*, yet it might be our duty to pray for them. And therefore though it be our duty to pray for *Princes*, it does not hence follow, that we may in no caſes lawfully reſiſt them.

In anſwer to this, I grant, that praying for any man, nay praying for *Kings* and *Princes* cannot of it ſelf prove, that it is unlawful to reſiſt them, if it otherwiſe appear, that reſiſtance is lawful; but if it be our duty to make ſupplications, prayers, and interceſſions for perſecuting *Princes*, as the Apoſtle commands them to pray for the *Roman Emperors*, who were profeſt enemies to Chriſtianity; that is, if they muſt beg all good things for them, a long and happy and proſperous Reign, which is included in interceſſions and prayers; this ſtrongly infers, that they muſt not reſiſt their power, nor undermine their Thrones. For we cannot very well at the ſame time pray for the proſperity of their government, and endeavour to pull it down. The Apoſtle did not underſtand thoſe conditional Prayers, that God would *Con-*

vert

vert or *Confound* them; a *prayer*, which thanks be to God, was never found in any Chriſtian *Liturgie* yet; which poſſibly is one reaſon, why ſome men are no great Friends to *Liturgies*. And when the Apoſtle directs them to *pray for Kings and all that are in authority, that they muſt live quiet and peaceable lives in all godlineſs and honeſty*, that is, that they might enjoy peace and ſecurity in the profeſſion and practice of the true Religion; this ſeems to imply, that when they are perſecuted for their Religion, which was the caſe at that time, they muſt pray for perſecuting Princes, that God would incline their hearts to favour his people; but muſt not fight againſt them. This is the only direction the Apoſtle gives them in the caſe; and we may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that had he known any other, he would not have concealed it. If it is always the duty of Chriſtians to pray for the proſperous and flouriſhing ſtate of the *Empire*, as by this Apoſtolical exhortation it appears to be, it could never be lawful for them to reſiſt the powers: for I cannot underſtand how any man without mocking Almighty God, can pray for the proſperity of his Prince, and the good

ſuc-

ſucceſs of his government, at the ſame time, when he fights againſt him. When St. *Paul* had ſo freely and openly declared againſt reſiſting the higher powers, which *Timothy*, who was his Scholar and Companion, and fellow-labourer, could not but know; what other interpretation could he make of the Apoſtles exhortation, to pray for Kings, and all that are in authority, that we may live quiet and peaceable lives in all godlineſs and honeſty, but only this, that prayer is the laſt and only remedy that we can have againſt perſecuting *Princes*? Had it been lawful for them to reſiſt, it had been a more proper prayer, that God would give them ſtrength and courage and counſel to oppoſe all his and their enemies: that he would appear as miraculouſly for their defence, as he formerly did in fighting the *Battels* of *Iſrael*; that he would ſet Chriſt upon his Throne, and make all the *Princes* of the earth give place to a more glorious Kingdom. Time was, when it was all one, whether he ſaved with many or a few. He knew how to deſtroy potent and formidable Armies, without any humane ſtrength and power, or by ſuch weak & contemptible means, as reſerved the

the glory of the victory intire to himſelf: and he is the ſame ſtill that ever he was, and his power is the ſame. But St. *Paul* very well knew, that it was not lawful for them to pull Emperours out of their Thrones, to give any diſturbance to civil powers, or to attempt any changes or innovations in government; and therefore ſince they muſt ſubmit to ſuch Princes as they had, there was no other remedy left them, but to beg of God ſo to incline the hearts of Princes, that they might enjoy a quiet and peaceable poſſeſſion of their Religion, even under Pagan Princes. For as much as ſome men of late days profanely ſcoff at prayers and tears, theſe have been always thought the onely remedy the Church has againſt perſecuting powers; and it ſeems St. *Paul* thought ſo too, for he preſcribes no other; and yet he does not allow them to pray againſt the King neither, but exhorts them to pray for him, and that they might enjoy peace and ſecurity under his Government.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

St. Peter's *Doctrine about Non-reſiſtance.*

HAving heard what St. *Paul*'s doctrine was, let us now conſider what St. *Peter* taught about this matter: he had as much reaſon to learn this leſſon as any of the Apoſtles, our Saviour having ſeverely rebuked him for drawing his ſword againſt the lawful powers, as you have already heard. And indeed, his raſh and intemperate zeal in this action coſt him very dear; for we have reaſon to believe, that this was the chief thing, that tempted him to deny his *Maſter*. He was afraid to own himſelf to be his Diſciple, or that he had been in the garden with him; becauſe he was conſcious to himſelf, that by drawing his ſword, and ſmiting the ſervant of the high Prieſt, he had incurred the penalty of the law, and had he been diſcovered, could expect nothing leſs, but to be ſeverely puniſh't for it, it may be to have loſt his life for his

his reſiſtance. And indeed, this has very often been the fate of thoſe men, who have been tranſported with a boiſtrous and intemperate zeal to draw their ſwords for their Maſter and his Religion againſt the lawful powers, that they commonly deny their Maſter, and deſpiſe his Religion, before they put their ſwords up again.

But St. *Peter* having by our Saviour's reproof, and his own dear-bought experience learn't the evil of reſiſtance, never drew his ſword more, and took great care to inſtruct Chriſtians not to do ſo, 1 Peter 2. 13, 14, 15, 16. *Submit your ſelves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's ſake, whether it be to the King as ſupreme; or unto Governours, as to them that are ſent by him, for the puniſhment of evil doers, and for the praiſe of them that do well. For ſo is the will of God, that with well doing, ye may put to ſilence the ignorance of fooliſh men. As free, and not uſing your liberty as a cloak of maliciouſneſs, but as the ſervants of God.*

This is the very ſame Doctrine, which St. *Paul* taught the Romans: *Let every ſoul be ſubject to the higher Powers*; for the ſame word is uſed in the ori-

original ὑποτάγητι and ὑποτασσέσθω, and therefore to submit and to be subject is the same thing, which, as St. *Paul* tells us, signifies *Non-resistance*. Onely as St. *Paul* speaks onely of not resisting the *Higher Powers*, that is, *Emperours* and *Soveraign Princes*, herein including all those, who act by their Authority; St. *Peter*, to prevent all cavils and exceptions, distinctly mentions both, that we must submit to all humane power and authority, not onely to the *King as Supreme*, that is, in St. *Paul's* phrase, to the *Higher Powers*, to all *Soveraign Princes* who are invested with the supreme Authority; but also to those, who *are sent by him*, who receive their Authority and commission from the *Soveraign Prince*.

St. *Paul* tells us at large, that *all power is of God*, and that the power is the *Minister of God*, and *he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God*; and *therefore we must needs be subject, not onely for Wrath*, that is, for fear of being punish't by men, *but also for Conscience sake*, out of reverence to God, and fear of his Judgement. This St. *Peter* comprises in one word, which includes it all; Submit your selves to every ordinance of man *for the Lord's sake:* for how

how is God concerned in our obedience to *Princes*, if they be not his Miniſters, who are appointed and advanced by him, and act by his Authority, and if it be not his will and command, that we ſhould obey them? and therefore he addes, for *this is the will of God, that with well doing*, that is, by obedience and ſubjection to Princes, *ye may put to ſilence the ignorance of fooliſh men*, that is, that you may put to ſilence thoſe fooliſh men, who ignorantly accuſe you, as fond of changes, and troubleſome and dangerous to Government. But then St. *Peter* obſerving, that Chriſtian Liberty was made a pretence for ſeditions and treaſons, he cautions them againſt that alſo, *As free, but not uſing your liberty for a cloak of Maliciouſneſs*, that is, to cover and excuſe ſuch wickedneſs as Rebellion againſt Princes, *but as the ſervants of God*: You muſt remember, whatever freedom Chriſt has purchas't for you, he has not delivered you from obedience and ſubjection to God; you are his ſervants ſtill, and therefore muſt be ſubject to thoſe, who receive their power and authority from God, as all *Soveraign Princes* do.

This is as plain, one would think, as words

words can make it; but nothing can be ſo plain, but that men who are unwilling to underſtand it, and who ſet their wits on work to avoid the force and evidence of it, may be able to find ſomething to ſay, to deceive themſelves, and thoſe who are willing to be deceived: and therefore it will be neceſſary to conſider, what falſe colours ſome men have put upon theſe words, to elude and baffle the plain ſcope and deſigne of the Apoſtle in them.

As firſt, they obſerve, that St. *Peter* calls *Kings* and ſubordinate Governours an ordinance of man, or a humane Creature, ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις. and from hence they conclude that *Kings* are onely the *peoples Creatures*; they are made by the *people*, and receive their power from them, and therefore are accountable to them if they abuſe their power. In anſwer to this, we may conſider,

1. That this interpretation of St. *Peter's* words, is a direct contradiction to St. *Paul*, who expreſly aſſerts, that there is no power but of God, the powers that be are ordained of God: but according to this expoſition of *humane Creature*, or the *Ordinance of Man*, there is no power of God, but all power is derived from the

the *People.* Kings and Princes may be choſen by men, as it is in *Elective Kingdoms,* and as it was at that time in the *Roman Empire*; but they receive their power from God, and thus St. *Paul* and St. *Peter* may be reconciled: but to affirm, that St. *Peter* calls Kings an Ordinance of man, becauſe they receive their power and authority from men, is an irreconcilable contradiction to St. *Paul*, who affirms, that they receive their power from God, that they are God's and not the peoples Miniſters. Now though St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* did once differ upon a matter of prudence, it would be of ill conſequence to Religion, to make them differ in ſo material a Doctrine as this is: and yet there is no way to reconcile them, but by expounding St. *Peter's* words ſo as to agree with St. *Paul's*; for St. *Paul's* words can never be reconciled with that ſence, which theſe men give of St. *Peter's*; and that is a good argument to me, that is not the true interpretation of St. *Peter*; for I verily believe, that theſe two great Apoſtles did not differ in this point.

2. St. *Peter* exhorts them to *ſubmit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's*

ſake; which plainly ſignifies, that whatever hand men may have in modelling civil governments, yet it is the Ordinance of God, and *Princes* receive their power from him. For it is no act of diſobedience to God to reſiſt our *Prince*, nor of obedience to God to ſubmit to him, if he does not derive his power from God, and act by his Authority and commiſſion; eſpecially in ſuch caſes, when he oppoſes the Government of God, and the intereſt of Religion; and oppreſſes not onely God's Creatures, but his moſt faithful and obedient people, who are his peculiar care and charge: in ſuch caſes as theſe, if *Princes* do not receive their power from God, they are oppoſite and rival Powers, and we can no more ſubmit to them for God's ſake, than we can ſubmit to a Rebel for the ſake of, that is, out of duty and loyalty to our *natural Prince*. And therefore when the Apoſtle exhorts them, for God's ſake to ſubmit to their King, he plainly ſuppoſes, what St. *Paul* did particularly expreſs, that Kings receive their power from God, and therefore are God's Miniſters, even when they abuſe their power; and he that reſiſts, reſiſts the Ordinance and Authority of God.

3. But

3. But ſuppoſe we ſhould grant, that when St. *Peter* calls Kings the Ordinance of man, he means, that they receive their power and authority from men; yet I cannot ſee, what good this will do them: for he plainly diſowns their conſequence, that therefore *Princes* are accountable to the People, as to their ſuperiours, and may be reſiſted, depoſed, and brought to condigne puniſhment, if they abuſe this power; as will appear from theſe two obſervations. 1. That he gives the King the Title of *ſupreme*, ὑπερέχοντι, who is above them all, and is inveſted with the ſupreme and ſoveraign power. Now the ſupreme power in the very notion of it, is irreſiſtible and unaccountable; for otherwiſe it is not ſupreme, but ſubject to ſome ſuperiour juriſdiction; which it is evidently known the *Roman Emperours*, of whom the Apoſtle here ſpeaks, were not. And 2. that he requires ſubjection to this humane ordinance, which, as appears from St. *Paul*, ſignifies *Non reſiſtance*. So that though we ſhould grant that the *King* derives his power from the people, yet it ſeems, God confirms and eſtabliſhes the Crown on his head, and will not ſuffer people to take it off again, when they pleaſe.

4. But after all, there is no colour for this objection from the Apoſtles words: for this ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις humane order or ordination, ſignifies nothing but humane authority, ſuch power and authority as is exerciſed by men for the good government of humane Societies. And the meaning is only this; that out of reverence and obedience to God, from whom all power is derived, they ſhould ſubmit to that authority, which is exerciſed by men, whether to the ſupream power of *Soveraign Princes*, or that ſubordinate authority which he beſtows on *inferiour Magiſtrates*.

2. It is farther objected, that though St. *Peter* does command Chriſtians to ſubmit to Kings and Governours, yet it is with a limitation, as far as they govern well, while they exerciſe their authority in purſuance of the great ends of its inſtitution; *for the puniſhment of evil doers, and for the praiſe of them that do well.* And here St. *Peter* agrees very well with St. *Paul*, who aſſigns this as the reaſon, why they may be ſubject to the powers: For *Rulers are not a terrour to good works, but to the evil; wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou ſhalt have praiſe*

praiſe of the ſame. For he is the miniſter of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid, for he beareth not the ſword in vain: for he is the miniſter of God, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil, 13 *Rom.* 3, 4. Now we cannot be bound to obey and ſubmit, any farther than the reaſon of our obedience reaches: and if the reaſon why we muſt obey Princes, is, becauſe they puniſh wickedneſs, and reward and encourage Vertue, which is ſo great a bleſſing to humane Societies, then we are not bound to obey them, when they do quite contrary; when they encourage Vice, and oppreſs the moſt exemplary innocence. Now in anſwer to this, let us conſider,

1. Whether theſe great Apoſtles intended to oblige the Chriſtians of that age to yield obedience to thoſe powers, which then governed the world. If they did, (as I think no man will be ſo hardy as to ſay, that they did not) then it will be proper to enquire, whether what they here affirm, and aſſign as the reaſon of their ſubjection, that *Rulers* are not a terrour to good works, but to the evil, were true of the *Roman Emperours* and Governours, or not. If it

were true, then I believe it will hold true of all *Kings*, in all ages of the world; for there cannot well be greater *Tyrants* than the *Roman Emperors* were at this time: and ſo this will prove an eternal reaſon, why we ſhould be ſubject to *Princes*, notwithſtanding the many faults and miſcarriages of their government. If it were not true, it is very ſtrange, that two ſuch great *Apoſtles*, ſhould uſe ſuch an argument to perſwade Chriſtians to ſubmit to the powers, as only proved the quite contrary, that they ought not to be ſubject to the preſent powers, becauſe they were unjuſt and Tyrannical, and in contradiction to the original deſign and inſtitution of civil power, were a terror to good works and not to the evil.

The *Chriſtians* were at that time perſecuted by *Jews* and *Heathens*, by all the powers of the World. The Apoſtle exhorts them not to reſiſt the powers, becauſe they were not a Terror to good works, but to the evil. If by this he only means, that they ſhould be ſubject to them, while they encouraged Vertue and vertuous men, but might rebel againſt them, when they did the contrary; how could the *Chriſtians* of thoſe days

days think themſelves obliged by this to ſubmit to the higher powers?

For this was not their caſe. They ſuffered for righteouſneſs ſake; the powers were a terrour to them, though they were innocent, though they could not charge them, either with breaking the Laws of God or Men; and therefore they were not bound to ſubmit to them, whenever they could find it ſafe to reſiſt. So that either theſe men put a falſe comment upon the Text, or while the *Apoſtle* undertakes to deter them from reſiſtance, he urges ſuch an argument as was proper only to perſwade them to rebel.

2. We may alſo conſider, that this interpretation of the words makes the Apoſtles argument childiſh and ludicrous, and wholly uſeleſs to perſwade any man to be ſubject, who needs perſwaſion. For I take it for granted, that there is no need to perſwade any man, eſpecially the good and vertuous, not to reſiſt the powers, when he meets with the juſt rewards and encouragements of Vertue. The uſual pretence for Seditions and Treaſons, is to redreſs publick grievances, to deliver themſelves from a ſtate of oppreſſion and ſlavery; but all

mankind agree, that they ought to obey Governours, who govern well; and no man thinks it juſt or honourable to rebel, who has not, or cannot pretend ſome cauſe of complaint. The tryal of our obedience is, when we ſuffer injuriouſly for righteouſneſs ſake, when our Rights and Liberties are invaded, when we groan under ſuch oppreſſions, as are enough to make a *wiſe man mad*, and to tranſport him to irregular and unjuſtifiable actions. This was the caſe of the Primitive Chriſtians to whom the Apoſtles wrote, and therefore we might reaſonably expect, that he ſhould urge ſuch Arguments to Subjection, as ſhould reach their caſe: but if theſe men be good Expoſitors, the Apoſtle ſays nothing to perſwade any man to obedience to the powers, who finds the powers uneaſie and troubleſome to him; and thoſe who have nothing to *complain* of, one would think, ſhould need no Arguments to perſwade them to ſubjection to ſo eaſie and gentle a yoak.

3. Nay, according to this interpretation of the Doctrine of *Subjection*, that we are bound only to be ſubject to thoſe *Princes*, who rule well, who puniſh wickedneſs and reward vertue; this Doctrine

of

of *Subjection* gives no ſecurity at all to the beſt governments in the world. The moſt Factious and Seditious ſpirits can deſire no greater liberty, than this principle grants them. For no humane government can be ſo exact and perfect, but it may be guilty of great miſcarriages. Good men may ſuffer, and bad men may flouriſh under a vertuous *Prince*, and therefore ill deſigning men can never want pretences to miſrepreſent the government, and to foment Diſcontents and Jealouſies between Prince and People. This unhappy Nation has been a ſad example of this, twice in one Age, under two as *juſt* and *merciful Princes*, as ever ſate upon the Engliſh Throne. When there were never fewer real grievances to be complained of, and never more loud and Tragical complaints: and if Subjects are not bound to obey any longer than all things pleaſe and gratifie their humors, it is a vain thing to name the Doctrine of *Subjection*; which is of no uſe at all to the peace and ſecurity of humane Societies.

4. This is abſolutely falſe, that we are bound to be ſubject to *Soveraign Princes* no longer than they rule well, according to the meaſures of Juſtice and

and righteouſneſs. The Apoſtle I am ſure ſuppoſes the contrary, when he tells the Chriſtians, *But and if ye ſuffer for righteouſneſs ſake, happy are ye; and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled,* 1 Pet. 3. 14. Thus he commands ſervants *to be ſubject to their Maſters with fear, not only to the good and gentle, but alſo to the froward. For this is thankworthy, if a man for conſcience towards God endure grief, ſuffering patiently. For what glory is it, if when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye take it patiently? but if when ye do well and ſuffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God,* 2 *Chap.* 18, 19, 20. And certainly there is as perfect a ſubjection due to a *Soverain Prince* as to a *Maſter*, for he is more eminently the Miniſter of God, and acts by a more Sacred and inviolable authority. And that this does extend to our ſubjection to *Princes*, appears from the example of Chriſt, which the Apoſtle there recommends to our imitation, who was the moſt innocent perſon in the world, and yet ſuffered the moſt barbarous uſage, not from the hands of a private Maſter, but of the ſupreme powers. And therefore when he commands in the ſame Chapter to ſub-

ſubmit to Governours, *as to thoſe who are for the puniſhment of evil doers, and the praiſe of them that do well*, it is evident, that he did not intend this as a limitation of our ſubjection, as if we were not bound to be ſubject in other caſes; ſince in the very ſame Chapter, he requires ſubjection not only to the *good and gentle, but alſo to the froward*, in imitation of the example of our Lord, who ſuffered patiently under unjuſt and Tyrannical powers.

5. I obſerve therefore, that the Apoſtle does not alleadge this as the reaſon of our ſubjection, but as a motive or argument to reconcile us to the practice of it. The reaſon of our ſubjection to *Princes* is, that they are advanced by God, that they are his Miniſters, that thoſe *who reſiſt, reſiſt the Ordinance of God*, and therefore *we muſt ſubmit for Gods ſake*, out of reverence to his authority. But it is an encouragement to ſubjection, to conſider the great advantages of government, that *Rulers are not a terrour to good works, but to the evil.* But though this motive ſhould fail in ſome inſtances, yet while the reaſon of ſubjection laſts, (and that can never fail, while we own the Soverain Authority of God) ſo long it is

our

our dutie to be ſubject, whether our *Prince* do his dutie or not.

6. But to examine more particularly the meaning of theſe words. When the Apoſtle ſays, that *Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil; that they are for the puniſhment of evil doers, and the praiſe of them that do well*; I ſee no neceſſitie of expounding this of good and evil works in general, that all good and virtuous actions ſhall be rewarded by them, and all evil actions puniſh't; for this is almoſt impoſſible in any humane government; and there never was any government in the world, that appointed rewards for all virtuous actions, and puniſhments for all wicked ones. But theſe good and evil works ſeem to be confined to the matter in hand, to ſubjection and obedience, as a good and virtuous action. And ſo the Apoſtle enforces this dutie of ſubjection, not onely from the Authoritie of God, but from the power of Princes: *Be ſubject to the higher powers; for Rulers are not a terrour to good works, but to the evil.* We need not fear the powers, when we obey them, and ſubmit ourſelves to them; but they will puniſh us if we rebel. The force of which argument is this:

The

The beſt way to obtain ſafetie and protection under any Government, is by being peaceable, quiet, and obedient; ſuch men generally eſcape under the greateſt *Tyrants*, for *Tyrants* themſelves do not uſe to inſult over the peaceable and obedient: but if men be ſeditious and troubleſome to government, then *he beareth not the ſword in vain, but is the Miniſter of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil*, that is, upon all diſobedience and rebellion; for whatever wickedneſs eſcapes unpuniſh't, Princes for their own ſecuritie muſt not ſuffer diſobedience and rebellion to eſcape. And that this is the meaning of it, appears from the next verſe, where the *Apoſtle* ſums up the whole argument for ſubjection, which he reduces to *Conſcience towards God, and fear* of the ſecular powers: *Wherefore ye muſt needs be ſubject, not onely for wrath, but alſo for Conſcience ſake.* And that St. *Peter* by well doing means ſubjection to *Princes*, is very plain. *For ſo is the will of God, that with well doing, ye ſhould put to ſilence the ignorance of fooliſh men*; that is, by obedience and ſubjection to *Princes*, which is the dutie he there exhorts them to. And therefore it is very probable that

that he means the ſame by *well doing* in the verſe before, that Governours are for the *puniſhment of evil* doers, *and the praiſe of them that do well*; to puniſh the diſobedient and rebellious, and to reward and protect thoſe, who live in all quiet and peaceable ſubjection. And if this be the meaning of it, I think they can find no limitation here of our *ſubjection to Princes.*

7. But let us ſuppoſe, that when the *Apoſtle* ſays, that *Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil,* he underſtands by it in general, the great advantages of civil government, that is, for the ſuppreſſion of wickedneſs, and incouragement of virtue, which is the true end and the beſt improvement of humane power; this alſo is in a great meaſure true of the worſt and moſt Tyrannical Princes, and therefore the argument for ſubjection is good even under a Tyrant.

Publick Juſtice was adminiſtred under the government of *Nero*, and good men were rewarded, and bad men puniſh't: And though Juſtice be not ſo equally and ſo univerſally adminiſtred under a *bad Prince*, as under a *good* one; though a Tyrant may oppreſs many of his

his ſubjects, and be the occaſion of great Calamities, yet while there is any publick government maintained in the world, it lays great reſtraints upon the unruly luſts and paſſions of men, and gives great ſecuritie to the juſt and innocent. And therefore good men are concerned to promote the peace and ſecuritie of Government, though the Prince be a Tyrant: for there is more Juſtice to be had under a *Tyrant*, than in a civil War. In ordinary caſes it is very poſſible for good men to live eaſily and tolerably under a very *bad Prince*; & though it ſhould be their lot to ſuffer, yet ſince the peace and quiet of humane Societies is in it ſelf ſo great a bleſſing, and the publick good is better conſulted by the preſervation of government, than by reſiſtance, it becomes every good man rather to ſuffer patiently under a *Tyrant*, than to ſhake and unſettle humane government, and diſturb the natural courſe of Juſtice by ſeditions and tumults.

8. Nay let us ſuppoſe, that the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of ſuch an equal adminiſtration of Juſtice, as cannot be expected under the government of a *Tyrant*; yet ſo the argument holds good againſt reſiſtance, though our *Prince* be never

never ſo bad. And it lies thus: we muſt not reſiſt the powers, becauſe *Rulers are not a terrour to good works, but to the evil.* This is the great bleſſing of humane government, to preſerve Juſtice and righteouſneſs among men. For this reaſon God has intruſted the *Princes* with the power of the ſword, for *the puniſhment of evil doers, and the praiſe of them that do well*; and therefore we muſt not reſiſt him, becauſe publick Juſtice is ſo great a bleſſing to the world. But how does this follow, you will ſay, that we muſt not reſiſt a Tyrant, who is ſo far from adminiſtring Juſtice, that he oppreſſes his ſubjects, becauſe Civil Government and Publick Juſtice is ſo great a bleſſing? what agreement is there between civil government, and publick Juſtice and a Tyrant? Why the conſequence is very plain. Civil government, which is for the adminiſtration of publick Juſtice, is a great and ineſtimable bleſſing to the world: but now there can be no civil government without a ſupreme and irreſiſtible power; publick Juſtice cannot be adminiſtred, unleſs there is ſome power from whence there is no appeal. It is not neceſſarie indeed, that the

power

power ſhould always be in the hands of one man; but if God have placed this power in the hands of a *Prince*, there it muſt be irreſiſtible too, however he uſes it: for if once it be made lawful to reſiſt the ſupreme Power, wherever it is plac't, you diſſolve humane Societies, or at leaſt expoſe them to perpetual diſorders and convulſions. Factious and ambitious men will find pretences to reſiſt good Princes as well as the bad, and no government can be any longer ſecure, than while ill-deſigning men want power to reſiſt. Now then, to paſs a true Judgement of this matter, we muſt not onely conſider, what preſent inconveniencies we may ſuffer from the irreſiſtible power of a *Tyrant*, but what an irreparable miſchief it is for ever to unſettle the foundations of government. We muſt conſider whether Civil Government be the greater bleſſing to mankind, or a *Tyrant* the greater curſe: whether it be more deſirable to endure the inſolence and injuſtice of a *Tyrant*, when the power falls into ſuch a hand; or for ever to be deprived of the ſecuritie of government, and the bleſſings of Peace and order. And therefore there is great reaſon, why God ſhould

ſo ſeverely forbid the reſiſtance of *Princes*, though *Tyrants*; and why we ſhould quietly and contentedly ſubmit to this divine appointment, becauſe the reſiſtance of the ſupreme power, were it once allowed by God, would weaken the authoritie of humane Governments, and expoſe them to the rage and frenzie of ambitious and diſcontented *Statesmen*, or wild *Enthuſiaſts*. This I think is a ſufficient anſwer to this pretence, that the Apoſtle limits our ſubjection to Princes to the regular exerciſe of their authoritie.

3. It is objected alſo from St. *Peters* words, that the inferiour and ſubordinate Magiſtrates receive their power from God alſo, as well as *ſupreme* and *Soveraign Princes*; Governours are ſent *by him*, that is, ſay they, by God, for *the puniſhment of evil doers, and the praiſe of them that do well*; and therefore though private men may not reſiſt a *Soveraign Prince*, yet publick Magiſtrates may, though they be not ſupreme; for it is their dutie alſo to ſee wickedneſs puniſh't, and virtue rewarded; and therefore it is part of their *Commiſſion* to give check to the Soveraign Power, and to defend ſubjects from the un-

unjuſt violence and oppreſſions of their *Prince*. And this the *Emperour Trajan* learn't from the common principles of Juſtice and Equitie, who delivered a ſword to one of his Officers with this charge, to uſe it for him, while he governed well, but againſt him if he governed ill. Now in anſwer to this, we may conſider,

1. That there is no foundation at all for this in the *Text*, for this δι αὐτοῦ or *by him*, cannot by any rules of Grammar be referred to God, but to the *King*. *Submit to every Ordinance of man for the Lord's ſake, whether to the King as ſupreme, or unto Governours, as unto them who are ſent by him. By him?* by whom? by God? that is not ſaid, but by the *King*, for that is the next antecedent; and that is the evident truth of the caſe. Inferiour Magiſtrates do not receive their power from *God*, but from the *King*, who having the Soveraign power in himſelf, commits the exerciſe of ſome part of it to others, and taketh it away again, when he pleaſes. And the very phraſe of πεμπομένοις δι αὐτοῦ, thoſe who are ſent by him, plainly refers it to thoſe who were ſent by the *Emperour* into forreign countries, to go-

vern the *Roman Provinces*; ſuch as *Pontius Pilate* and *Felix* were: and ſo the meaning is, that they were not onely obliged to ſubmit to the *Roman Emperours*, but to all thoſe Governours, whom they ſent to rule the Provinces under their Juriſdiction; which is no more than for a Preacher to inſtruct the ſubjects of *Ireland*, that they muſt not onely ſubmit to the King, but to all thoſe whom he ſent to govern them, with the power and authoritie of *Deputies*, or *Lord-Lieutenants*.

2. Nay St. *Peter*, as if he had foreſeen this objection, takes particular care to prevent it, and therefore makes an apparent difference between that ſubmiſſion we owe to *Soveraign Princes*, and that which we owe to Governours; we muſt ſubmit *to the King as ſupreme*, ὡς ὑπερέχοντι as to him who is above all, whoſe power is unaccountable and irreſiſtible; but *to Governours, as unto them who are ſent by him:* which both ſignifies the reaſon of our ſubmiſſion to Governours, and preſcribes the bounds and meaſures of it.

The reaſon why we muſt ſubmit to *Governours*, is becauſe they are ſent by our *Prince*, they act by his Authoritie, and

and therefore we muſt ſubmit to, and reverence his Authoritie in them. It is not for their own ſakes, nor for any inherent Authoritie in them, but as they receive their power from our *Prince*.

And this alſo determines the bounds and meaſures of our ſubjection to Governours. As that Authoritie, which they receive from the *King*, is the onely reaſon why we muſt ſubmit to them at all: ſo we muſt ſubmit no longer, than that Authoritie laſts; when ever the *Prince* recalls them, and transfers this power to another, we muſt obey them no longer. Nay, ſince we are only bound to reverence and obey the authoritie of our *Prince* in them, we muſt never ſubmit to them in oppoſition to our *Prince*. Our primarie obligation is to ſubmit to the *King*, who is our *Soveraign Lord*, and muſt in no caſes be reſiſted; our ſubmiſſion to Governours and ſubordinate Magiſtrates is onely a part and branch of our dutie to the *King*, as they are his Officers and Miniſters: and therefore it can never be our dutie to obey or comply with ſubordinate Magiſtrates, but onely when it is an act of dutie and ſubjection to our *Prince*; and certainly it is no act of ſubjection

to our *Prince* to obey ſubordinate Magiſtrates, when they rebel againſt their *Prince:* for, to reſiſt a *Prince*, or to joyn with thoſe who do reſiſt him, is an odde kind of inſtance of our ſubjection to him. This is not to ſubmit to the *King as ſupreme, nor to Governours, as unto thoſe who are ſent by him*, and receive their Authoritie from him; but it is to ſubmit to Governours, as the ſupreme and ſoveraign *Judges* of our *Prince*, and the *Patrons* and *Protectors* of the *people* againſt their *Prince*; which is directly contrarie to St. *Peter*'s Doctrine.

It was no new thing for the Governours of remote *Provinces* to revolt from the obedience of the *Roman Emperours*, and to uſurp a Soveraign and Imperial Authoritie to themſelves; and therefore St. *Peter* expreſſes their dutie to Governours with this caution and limitation, that though they muſt ſubmit to thoſe, whom the Emperour ſent to govern them, yet it muſt be in ſubordination to the Imperial Authoritie, and with a reſerve of that more abſolute ſubjection, which they owe to the *Emperour* himſelf, who is their *Soveraign Lord*. While Governours are ſubject to the *Emperour*, who is their Lord and Maſter,

ſter, we muſt be ſubject to them; but if they rebel, we muſt be ſubject to the *Emperour* ſtill, and oppoſe thoſe, whom we were before bound to obey.

When St. *Peter* ſo expreſly commands them both to ſubmit to the *King*, and to ſubmit to Governours, it is impoſſible he could conſider the *King* and Governous, as two diſtinct and rival authorities; for then it might ſo happen, that they could not ſubmit to both, if ever they ſhould oppoſe each other: and therefore when he commands them to ſubmit to both, he muſt ſuppoſe them to be both one, as the fountain and the ſtream is one. The Authoritie to which they muſt ſubmit is but one, it is originally in the *King*, as in its ſource and fountain, and it is derived and communicated to Governours; but is the ſame power ſtill, which as neceſſarily depends upon the *King*, as light does upon the Sun; and therefore when theſe powers grow two, when this derivative and dependant power ſets up for it ſelf in oppoſition to that power which gave it its being, we are delivered from our ſubjection to it, becauſe it ceaſes to be one with that ſoveraign power, to which we muſt be ſubject.

Once more. St. *Peter* commands the Chriſtians to ſubmit to the *King*, and to *Governours*, that is, to the King's Miniſters, who receive their authority from him to govern. But when ſuch perſons rebel againſt their *Prince* who gave them authority, they ceaſe to be the Kings Miniſters and Governours, and therefore ceaſe to be ſuch Governours to whom the Apoſtle commands ſubmiſſion. We are to obey them while they are the *Kings* Miniſters and Deputies; but when they aſſume to themſelves an independant power, we muſt ſubmit to them no longer, but to our *Prince*: We may and ought to obey our *Prince*, and thoſe Magiſtrates whom he ſets over us, but we cannot ſubmit to our *Prince* and to *Rebels*; and certainly when men become *Rebels*, they are no longer the *Kings* Miniſters, but his *Rivals*.

3. It is a very ridiculous pretence alſo, which has no foundation in St. *Peter*'s words, that Governours or ſubordinate Magiſtrates have power to controul or reſiſt their *Soverain Prince*. The Apoſtle tells us, that the King is ſupreme; but over whom is he ſupreme? certainly over all in his Dominions, or elſe he is not ſupreme; and therefore he

is

is ſupreme with reſpect to ſubordinate Magiſtrates, as well as private Subjects; and then they have no more power or authority to reſiſt, than any private Subject has. For St. *Paul* tells us, the *higher Power* is irreſiſtible; which would be a ſtrange Paradox, if every little Officer had authority to reſiſt him.

And yet if men will grant, that it is never lawful for any private man to reſiſt his *Prince*, it is not worth diſputing, whether ſubordinate Magiſtrates may or not; for if private men muſt not reſiſt, theſe inferiour Magiſtrates cannot, or at leaſt they will reſiſt to no purpoſe. He may make them private men again when he pleaſes; or however, he muſt be an *unfortunate Prince*, whom all his own Officers and Miniſters conſpire againſt; and he muſt be a very *weak Prince*, who has not force and power to oppoſe them. For what does the diſcontent of the greateſt *Miniſters* ſignifie, who can raiſe no forces to oppoſe their *Prince?* and yet there are no forces to be raiſed, if private men muſt not reſiſt. When inferiour Magiſtrates muſt ſubmit, or rebel alone, (as they muſt do, if private men muſt not rebel) whatever autho-

authority they have to controul their Prince, they will want force and power to do it. And yet it would be a lewd way of burleſquing this Doctrine of *Non-reſiſtance*, to make no more of it than this, that when St. *Paul* ſo ſeverely threatens damnation againſt thoſe who reſiſt, his meaning is, that private Subjects muſt not reſiſt their Prince, unleſs they have ſome diſcontented and factious Magiſtrates to head them.

But how ſhould theſe *ſubordinate Governours* come by this power to reſiſt their *Prince?* They muſt either have it from *God*, or from their *Prince*. Not from *God*. For *Soverain Princes* receive their authority from God; and if God have beſtowed the ſupreme and Soverain Power on the *Prince*, it is a contradiction to ſay, that he has advanced his own Miniſters and Officers above him; which would be to place a ſuperiour power over the ſupreme. Nor is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that inferiour Magiſtrates receive ſuch a power as this from their *Prince*, though it is evident, they have no power, but what they receive from him. For notwithſtanding *Trajan*'s complement, which he never intended ſhould be made a Law for himſelf,

ſelf, or other Soverain Princes; no Prince can give ſuch power as this to a Subject, without giving him his Crown. He gives away his Soverain power, when he gives any Subject authority to reſiſt; he ceaſes to be a *Soverain Prince*, if he makes any man his Superior: for he cannot give away Soverain power, and yet keep it himſelf. And it would be a hard caſe with *Princes*, had they as many Judges and Maſters, as they have Officers and Miniſters of State. Indeed, no *Prince* without parting with his Crown, can grant ſuch an extravagant power to any Subject: for while he continues Soverain, God has made it neceſſary to the greateſt Subjects to obey and ſubmit. For as for *Trajan*'s ſaying to one of his Commanders, when he delivered him the Sword, *Uſe this for me if I govern well, and againſt me if I govern ill*, it only ſignified his fixt reſolution to govern well, and that he would imploy it in no ill ſervices: but it conveyed no more power to him to rebel, if he ſhould govern ill, than a Father's ſaying to his Son, that he ſhould forgive his diſobedience, if ever he would prove unkind, would juſtifie the diſobedience of the Son, if his Father ſhould prove

un-

unkind. The duties of these relations are fixt by God, and cannot be altered by men. A *Prince* may divest himself of his Kingdom, and royal Power; but while he continues Soveraign, he cannot give liberty to any man to resist him.

4. There is another objection not only to invalidate St. *Peters* authoritie, but to answer all the arguments that are produced from the doctrine and practice of Christ and his Apostles, to inforce this dutie of Non-resistance and subjection to Princes; and that is, that these commands were onely temporarie, and obliged Christians while they wanted force and power to resist, but do not oblige us, when we can resist and conquer too.

I have sometimes thought, that this objection ought to be answered onely with indignation and abhorrence, as an open contempt of the authoritie of the Scriptures, and blasphemie against the holy Spirit, by which they were indited; but it may be, it is better to answer and expose it, and let the world see, besides the notorious folly of it, how near a kin the doctrine of Resistance is to Atheism, Infidelity, and Blasphemy.

1.

1. Firſt then I obſerve, that this very objection ſuppoſes that the doctrine of the Goſpel is againſt Reſiſtance; for thoſe who evade the authoritie of the Scriptures, by ſaying, that Chriſtians were then forbid to reſiſt, becauſe they wanted power to conquer, muſt grant, that reſiſtance is forbid. Which is a plain confeſſion, that they are conſcious to themſelves, that all the arts they have us'd to make the Scriptures ſpeak their ſence, and juſtifie the Doctrine of Reſiſtance, will not do. And therefore when men are once reduced to this laſt refuge, to confeſs, that the Scriptures are againſt them, if they have any modeſty left, they ought never to pretend to the authority of the Scriptures in this cauſe more. And this is a ſufficient anſwer to all men, who have any reverence for the authority of the Scriptures, that they cannot reſiſt their *Prince* without diſobeying the plain and expreſs Laws of the Goſpel; for he is a bold man, who will venture his eternal Salvation, upon pleading his exemption from any expreſs Law.

2. I would deſire all men who have any reverence left for the Religion of our Saviour, to conſider ſeriouſly how this

this pretence does disparage and weaken the authority of the Gospel, and make it a very imperfect, and a very uncertain rule of Life, which every man may fit and accommodate to his own humour and inclinations.

Christ and his Apostles do in the most express terms, and under the most severe penalties, forbid the resistance of Soveraign Princes. But say these men, this law does not oblige us now, though it did oblige the Christians of those days; for our circumstances are much changed and altered. The Christians at that time were weak, and unable to resist, and therefore were taught to suffer patiently without resistance; but thanks be to God, the case is not thus now; and therefore we may vindicate our natural and religious rights and liberties against all unjust violence. Now observe what follows from hence:

1. That the Gospel of our Saviour is a very imperfect and uncertain rule of life; that it absolutely forbids things, which are not absolutely evil, but sometimes lawful, without allowing for such a difference: that it gives general laws, which oblige onely at certain times, or in some circumstances, without giving any

any notice in what caſes they do not oblige; which is a mightie ſnare to mens conſciences, or a great injury to their Chriſtian libertie. It impoſes this hard neceſſitie upon them, either to make bold with a divine law, if they do reſiſt Tyrannical powers, which is grievous to a tender conſcience, which has any reverence for God; or to ſuffer injuriouſly, when they need not, had they been plainly inſtructed in their dutie, and acquainted in what caſes they might reſiſt, and in what not. And I think, there cannot be a greater reproach to the Goſpel, than to make it ſuch an imperfect and inſnaring rule.

2. Nay, this charges Chriſt and his Apoſtles with want of ſinceritie in preaching the Goſpel; for either they knew, that this Doctrine of *Non-reſiſtance* did not oblige all Chriſtians, but onely thoſe who are weak and unable to reſiſt, or they did not. If we ſay they did not, we charge them with ignorance: if we ſay they did, with diſhoneſtie: for if they knew, that all Chriſtians were not obliged to ſuch an abſolute ſubjection to *Princes*, as in no caſe to reſiſt, why did they conceal ſo important a truth, without giving the leaſt in-

intimation of it? Did they think this ſo ſcandalous a Doctrine, that they were afraid or aſhamed to publiſh it to the world? and can any thing be a Doctrine of the Goſpel, which is truly ſcandalous? But was the Doctrine of *reſiſtance* more ſcandalous, than the Doctrine of the *Croſs*? Would this have offended *Princes*, and make them more implacable enemies to Chriſtianitie? But would it not alſo have made more converts? would not a libertie to reſiſt the powers, and defend themſelves, been a better inducement to imbrace Chriſtianitie, than a neceſſitie of ſuffering the worſt things for the Name of Chriſt? would not this have contributed very much to the converſion of the whole *Jewiſh Nation*, who were fond of a *Temporal Kingdom*, had Chriſtianitie allowed them to caſt off the *Roman* Yoke, and reſtored their ancient liberties? How ſoon ſhould we have ſeen the *Croſs* in their *Banners*, and how gladly would they have fought under that victorious ſigne, under the conduct of ſo many wonder-working Prophets? and how ſoon would this have made the Doctrine of *Non-reſiſtance* uſeleſs and out of date, by making Chriſtians powerful enough

enough to reſiſt? So that there is no imaginable reaſon, why Chriſt and his Apoſtle ſhould conceal this Doctrine of the lawfulneſs of reſiſting perſecuting and Tyrannical powers, eſpecially at that time, when if it had been lawful, there was as much uſe for it, and as great reaſon to preach it, as ever there was, or ever can be. And therefore we muſt either think very ill of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, or acknowledge, that this is no Goſpel-Doctrine, never was, and never can be any part of the Religion of the Croſs. There is no reaſon, why Chriſt ſhould at firſt plant Chriſtianity in the world by ſufferings, if it might afterwards be maintained and propagated by glorious rebellions.

3. If this plea be allowed, it weakens the Authoritie of all the laws of the Goſpel, and leaves men at libertie to diſpence with themſelves, when they ſee or fancie any reaſon for it. *Non-reſiſtance* is as abſolutely commanded, as any other law of the Goſpel; but theſe men imagine, without any other reaſon, but becauſe they would have it ſo, that this law onely concerned Chriſtians in the weak and Infant-ſtate of the Church, while they were unable to reſiſt. Now ſhou'd o-

ther men take the ſame libertie with other laws (and I know no reaſon but why they may) how eaſie were it to expound Chriſtianitie out of the world? Meekneſs, patience, humilitie, ſelfdenial, contempt of the world, forgiving enemies, contentment in all conditions, are parts and branches of this ſuffering Religion; and may we not with as much reaſon ſay, that theſe duties were calculated for the afflicted and ſuffering ſtate of the Church, when the profeſſion of Chriſtianitie was diſcouraged in the world, and expoſed them to the loſs of all things, and therefore made it impoſſible for them to enjoy thoſe pleaſures and advantages of life, which other men did; but that they do not more oblige us than reſiſtance, now the Church is flouriſhing and proſperous? And thus men may juſtifie their pride and ambition and covetouſneſs, and may be as very Idolaters of the riches and pleaſures and honours of the world, as Heathens themſelves, when Chriſtianity became the Religion of the Empire: it did indeed make too great an alteration in the lives of Chriſtians. But according to this way of reaſoning, it made as great an alteration in Religion it ſelf; at this rate we ought

ought to have two Goſpels, one for the afflicted, the other for the proſperous ſtate of the Church; which differ as much as *Chriſtianity* and *Paganiſm* in the great rules of life. But we are hard dealt with, that we have but one Goſpel, and that the Suffering Goſpel; and for my part, I dare not undertake to make another. So that this plea for reſiſtance in oppoſition to the plain and expreſs Laws of the Goſpel, in the conſequences of it, ſtrikes at the very foundations of Chriſtianitie, and becomes the mouth of none but an *Atheiſt* or an *Infidel*.

4. This is a very abſurd pretence, that the Apoſtle forbids the Chriſtians of thoſe days to reſiſt, onely becauſe they were weak, and unable to reſiſt. This is a great reproach to the Apoſtle, as if he were of the temper of ſome men, who crouch and flatter, and pretend great loyaltie, when they are afraid to rebel, but are loyal no longer than they have an opportunitie to rebel. This is diſſimulation and flatterie, and inconſiſtent with the open ſimplicitie of the Apoſtolick Spirit; but it is very ſtrange that the Apoſtle ſhould ſo ſeverely forbid reſiſtance, when he knew they could not reſiſt. One would think common

Prudence should teach such men to be quiet and Subject; and therefore his zeal and vehemence would perswade one, that as weak as the Christians were, yet in those days they could have resisted. Nay, it is evident, that there were a sort of men who in those days called themselves Christians, and yet did resist the powers; such were the *Gnostick Hereticks*, who *despised Government*, who were *presumptuous and self-willed*, and were *not afraid to speak evil of dignities*, 2. Peter 2. 10. Jude *v.* 8. for to reproach and vilifie Government, is one degree of resistance; and no men are so weak, but they may do that. Nay, though Christians had not power enough of their own to have rebelled against the *Roman Government*, yet they had opportunitie enough to joyn and conspire with those who had, and to have made good terms and conditions for themselves. They lived in a very factious age, when both Jews and Heathens were very apt to rebel, and could both have promoted and strengthned the Faction, if they had pleased, and have grown very acceptable to them by doing so; and though no man knows what the event of any rebellion will be,

till

till he tries, yet they might have eſcaped as well as other men. This the Apoſtle knew, and this he was afraid of, and this he warns them againſt; and that for ſuch reaſons, as plainly ſhew, that it was not a meer prudential advice he gives them, for that time, but a ſtanding Law of their Religion.

5. For this Doctrine of *Non-reſiſtance* is urged with ſuch reaſons and arguments, as are good in all ages of the Church, as well when Chriſtians have power to reſiſt and conquer, as when they have not. Thus (1.) St. *Paul* inforces this dutie of ſubjection to the *Higher powers*, becauſe *all powers are of God*; *the powers that be are ordained of God*; and therefore *he that reſiſteth the powers*, *reſiſteth the Ordinance of God.* Now if they muſt obey the powers, becauſe they are from God, *Subjection* and *Non-reſiſtance* is as much our dutie, when we have power to reſiſt, as when we have not; and is as much our dutie at this day, as it was in the time of the Apoſtle, if we believe, that God has as great a hand in ſetting up Kings now, as he had then.

2. He threatens eternal damnation againſt thoſe, who reſiſt: *He that reſiſts*

ſhall receive unto himſelf damnation; which ſuppoſes, that there is a moral evil in reſiſtance, and therefore that Non-reſiſtance is an eternal and unchangeable Law: which cannot be true, if it be lawful to reſiſt, when we can reſiſt to ſome purpoſe, when we can reſiſt and conquer. It is fooliſh indeed to reſiſt a *Prince*, when we have not ſufficient force to oppoſe againſt him; but it would be a hard caſe, if a man ſhould periſh etenally, for doing an action, which is lawful in it ſelf, but imprudently undertaken. Theſe men had need look well to themſelves, how lawful ſoever they think reſiſtance to be, if every imprudent and unfortunate Rebel muſt be damned.

3. St. *Paul* addes, that *we muſt needs be ſubject, not onely for wrath, but alſo for Conſcience ſake*; that is, not onely out of fear of men, but out of Conſcience of our dutie to God. Now if reſiſtance were not in its nature ſinful, it were a very prudential Conſideration, not to reſiſt for fear of wrath, that is, for fear of being puniſh't by men, if we cannot conquer; but there would be no conſcience in the caſe, no ſence of any dutie to God; unleſs we think, that *Non-reſiſtance* is our dutie,

duty, when we cannot conquer, and reſiſtance when we can.

4. St. *Peter* tells us, that this ſubjection to Kings and Governours is a good and vertuous action, and therefore he calls it *well-doing: For ſo is the will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to ſilence the ignorance of fooliſh men*; that is, by ſubmitting to *Kings* and *Governours*, as you have already heard. Now the nature of Vertue and Vice cannot alter with the circumſtances of our condition; that which is good in one age, is ſo in another; which ſhews, that *Subjection* and *Non-reſiſtance* was not a temporary law, and meer matter of prudence, but an eſſential duty of Chriſtian Religion.

5. For it appears by what he adds, that it was a great credit and reputation to Chriſtianity, that it made men quiet, peaceable, and governable; *By well-doing they put to ſilence the ignorance of fooliſh men*; by their peaceable and obedient behaviour to their Governours, they ſham'd thoſe men, who ignorantly reproach't the Chriſtian Religion. Now hence there are two plain conſequents:

1. That ſubjection to government is a thing of very good repute in the world,

or else it could be no Credit to Christianity; and this is a good argument that subjection to Government is a great Vertue, because all men speak well of it. It is a thing of *good report*, and therefore becomes Christians, 4 *Phil.* 8.

2. It hence follows also, that subjection to Government was a standing Doctrine of the Christian Religion, because it was the will of God, that they should recommend Christianity to the world by *subjection* to *Princes*. But certainly God never intended they should put a cheat upon the world, and recommend Christianity to them, by that, which is no part nor duty of Christianity.

This is abundantly sufficient to confute that vain pretence, that the Doctrine of *Subjection* and *Non-resistance* obliged Christians only, while they were unable to resist and defend themselves; and this is enough to satisfie us, what the Doctrine of the Apostles was about subjection to *Princes*.

As for their examples, I think there was never any dispute about that. It is sufficiently known, that they suffered Martyrdom, as a vast number of Christians in that and some following Ages did, without either reproaching their Gover-

Governours, or rebelling againſt them: and this they did, as they taught others to do, not meerly becauſe they could not reſiſt, but out of duty and reverence to God, who ſets Princes on Thrones, and has given them a ſacred and inviolable Authority; and in imitation of their great Lord and Maſter, who went as a Lamb to the ſlaughter, and as a ſheep before the ſhearer is dumb, ſo he opened not his mouth.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

An ANSWER *to the most Popular Objections against* NON-RESISTANCE.

I Proceed now to consider those objections, which are made against the Doctrine of *Non-resistance*; though methinks after such plain and convincing proof, that *Non-resistance* is the Doctrine both of the Old and New Testament, though witty men may be able to start some objections, yet wise and good men should not regard them: for no objection is of any force, against a plain and express Law of God. Indeed, when we have no evidence for a thing but only Natural Reason, and the reason seems to be equally strong and cogent on both sides, it renders the matter very doubtful, on which side the truth lies: but when on one side there is a plain and express *Revelation* of the will of God, and on the other side some shew and appearance of reason, I think there can be no dispute

diſpute, which ſide we chuſe; unleſs any man think it doubtful, which is the moſt certain and infallible rule, *Scripture* or *meer natural reaſon.* And therefore till men can anſwer that Scripture-evidence, which I have produced, (which I am not much concerned about, for I gueſs it will take them up ſome time to do it) all their other objections, whether I could anſwer them or not, ſignifie nothing at all to me, and ought to ſignifie as little to any man, who reverences the Scriptures. But let us conſider their objections: for they are not ſo formidable, that we need be afraid of them.

Now I know no body, but will acknowledge, that in moſt caſes it is the duty of Subjects not to reſiſt their *Prince*; but they only pretend, that this is not their duty, when their *Prince* oppreſſes and perſecutes them contrary to Law: when their Lives and Liberties and Properties and Religion are all ſecured by the Laws of the Land, they ſee no reaſon why they ſhould tamely ſuffer a *Prince* to uſurp upon them, why they ſhould not defend themſelves againſt all unjuſt and illegal violence; and they urge ſeveral arguments to prove, that they may do ſo; which may be reduced to theſe five. 1. That

1. That they are bound by no Law to suffer against Law. 2. That the Prince has no authority against Law. 3. That they have a natural right of self-defence against unjust violence. 4. That otherwise we destroy the distinction between an *absolute* and *limited* Monarch; between a *Prince* whose *will* is his Law, and a *Prince* who is bound to govern by Law; which undermines the Fundamental Constitution of the English Government. 5. That if resistance in no case be allowed, the mischiefs and inconveniencies to mankind may be intolerable. I suppose it will be acknowledged, that these five particulars do contain the whole strength of their cause; and if I can give a fair answer to them, it must either make men Loyal, or leave them without excuse.

1. They urge, that they are bound by no Law to suffer against Law. Suppose, as a late Author does, that a Popish Prince should persecute his Protestant Subjects in *England* for professing the Protestant Religion which is established by Law; *By what Law* (saies he) *must we die? not by any Law of God surely, for being of that Religion, which he approves,*

Julian the Apostate.

proves, and would have all the world to embrace, and to hold fast to the end. Nor by the Laws of our Country, where Protestancy is so far from being criminal, that it is death to desert it, and to turn Papist. By what Law then? by none that I know of, saies our *Author*: nor do I know of any; and so far we are agreed. But then both the Laws of God and of our Countrie, command us not to resist: and if death, an illegal unjust death follow upon that, I cannot help it; God and our Countrie must answer for it. It is a wonderful discoverie, which this *Author* has made, that when we suffer against Law, we are condemned by no Law to die: for if we were, we could not suffer against Law: and it is as wonderful an argument he uses to prove, that we may resist, when we are persecuted against Law, because we are condemned by no Law to die; which is supposed in the very question, and is neither more nor less, than to affirm the thing which he was to prove. We may resist a Prince who persecutes against Law, because we are condemned by no Law, that is, because he persecutes against Law. This proves indeed, that we ought not to die, when we are condemned by no Law to die,

die; but whether we may preserve our selves from an unjust and violent death by resisting a persecuting Prince, is another question.

2. It is urged, that a Prince has no authoritie against Law; *There is no authority on earth above the Law, much less against it. It is Murder to put a man to death against Law; and if they knew who had authority to commit open, bare-faced, and downright Murders, this would direct them where to pay their Passive Obedience; but it would be the horridest slander in the world to say, that any such power is lodged in the Prerogative, as to destroy men contrary to Law.*

Now I perfectly agree with them in this also, that a *Prince* has no just and legal authoritie to act against Law; that if he knowingly persecute any Subject to death contrary to Law, he is a Murderer, and that no *Prince* has any such *Prerogative* to commit *open, bare-faced and downright murders.* But what follows from hence? does it hence follow, therefore we may resist and oppose them, if they do? This I absolutely denie; because God has expresly commanded us not to resist: And I see no inconsistencie between these two propositions

ſitions, that a *Prince* has no Legal Authoritie to perſecute againſt Law, and yet that he muſt not be reſiſted, when he does. Both the Laws of God, and the Laws of our Countrie, ſuppoſe theſe two to be very conſiſtent. For notwithſtanding the poſſibilitie, that *Princes* may abuſe their power, and tranſgreſs the Laws, whereby they ought to govern; yet they Command Subjects in no caſe to reſiſt: and it is not ſufficient to juſtifie reſiſtance, if Princes do, what they have no juſt Authoritie to do, unleſs we have alſo a juſt Authoritie to reſiſt. He, who exceeds the juſt bounds of his Authoritie, is lyable to be called to an account for it; but he is accountable onely to thoſe, who have a ſuperior authoritie to call him to an account. No power whatever is accountable to an inferiour; for this is a contradiction to the very notion of Power, and deſtructive of all Order and Government. Inferiour Magiſtrates are on all hands acknowledged to be lyable to give an account of the abuſe of their power; but to whom muſt they give an account? not to their inferiours; not to the people, whom they are to Govern, but to ſuperiour Magiſtrates, or to the *Sove-*

raign

raign Prince, who governs all. Thus the *Soveraign Prince* may exceed his Authoritie, and is accountable for it to a ſuperiour power; but becauſe he has no ſuperiour power on earth, he cannot be reſiſted by his own Subjects, but muſt be reſerved to the Judgement of God, who alone is the *King of Kings*. To juſtifie our reſiſtance of any power, there are two things to be proved. 1. That this power has exceeded its juſt Authoritie. 2. That we have Authoritie to reſiſt. Now theſe men indeed prove the firſt very well, that *Princes*, who are to govern by Law, exceed their legal Authoritie when they perſecute againſt Law: but they ſay not one word of the ſecond, that Subjects have authoritie to reſiſt their *Prince*, who perſecutes againſt Law; which was the onely thing, that needed proof: but this is a hard task, and therefore they thought it more adviſeable to take it for granted, than to attempt to prove it. They ſay indeed, *that an inauthoritative act, which carries no obligation at all, cannot oblige Subjects to obedience.* Now this is manifeſtly true, if by obedience they mean an *active obedience*; for I am not bound to do an ill thing, or an illegal action, becauſe my

my *Prince* commands me; but if they mean *Paſſive Obedience*, it is as manifeſtly falſe; for I am bound to obey, that is, not to reſiſt my *Prince*, when he offers the moſt unjuſt and illegal violence.

Nay, it is very falſe and abſurd to ſay, that every illegal, is an inauthoritative act, which carries no obligation with it. This is contrarie to the practice of all *humane Judicatures*, and the daily experience of men, who ſuffer in their lives, bodies, or eſtates by an unjuſt and illegal ſentence. Every Judgement contrarie to the true meaning of the law, is in that ſence illegal; and yet ſuch illegal Judgements have their Authoritie and obligation, till they are reſcinded by ſome higher Authoritie. This is the true reaſon of appeals from inferiour to ſuperiour Courts, to rectifie illegal proceedings, and reverſe illegal Judgements; which ſuppoſes that ſuch illegal acts have authoritie, till they are made null and void by a higher power: and if the higher powers from whence lies no appeal, confirm and ratifie an unjuſt and illegal ſentence, it carries ſo much authoritie and obligation with it, that the injured perſon has no redreſs, but muſt patiently

tiently submit; and thus it must necessarily be, or there can be no end of disputes, nor any order and Government in humane Societies.

And this is a plain demonstration, that though the Law be the rule according to which *Princes* ought to exercise their authoritie and power, yet the authoritie is not in *Laws*; but in *Persons*; for otherwise why is not a sentence pronounced according to Law by a private person, of as much Authoritie, as a sentence pronounced by a Judge? how does an illegal sentence pronounced by a Judge, come to have any Authoritie? for a sentence contrarie to Law, cannot have the Authoritie of the Law. Why is a legal or illegal sentence reversible, and alterable, when pronounced by one Judge, and irreversible and unalterable, when pronounced by another? For the Law is the same, and the sentence is the same, either according to Law or against it, whoever the Judge be; but it seems the Authoritie of the Persons is not the same, and that makes the difference; so that there is an Authoritie in Persons, in some sence distinct from the Authoritie of Laws, nay superiour to it. For there is such an Authoritie, as, though it

cannot

cannot make an illegal act legal, yet, can and often does make an illegal act binding and obligatorie to the Subjects, when pronounced by a competent Judge.

If it be ſaid, that this very authoritie is owing to the law, which appoints Judges and Magiſtrates to decide controverſies, and orders appeals from inferiour to ſuperiour Courts: I would onely ask one ſhort queſtion, Whether the law gives authoritie to any perſon to judge contrarie to law. If it does not, then all illegal acts are null and void, and lay no obligation on the Subject: and yet this is manifeſtly falſe, according to the known Practice of all the known Governments in the world. The moſt illegal Judgement is valid, till it be reverſt by ſome ſuperiour Power; and the Judgement of the ſupreme power, though never ſo illegal, can be repealed by no authoritie but its own. And yet it is abſurd to ſay, that the law gives any man authoritie to Judge contrarie to law: for, to be ſure, this is beſides the end and intention of the law. Whence then does an illegal act or Judgement derive its authoritie and obligation? the anſwer is plain, It is from the

authoritie of the *Person*, whose act or Judgement it is.

It will be of great use to this controversie, to make this plain and obvious to every understanding; which therefore I shall endeavour to do, as briefly as may be.

1. Then I observe, that there must be a personal power and authoritie antecedent to all civil laws. For there can be no laws without a Law-maker, and there can be no Law-maker, unless there be one or more persons invested with the power of Government, of which making laws is one branch. For a law is nothing else, but the publick and declared will and command of the Law-maker, whether he be the Soveraign *Prince*, or the *People*.

2. And hence it necessarily follows, that a *Soveraign Prince* does not receive his authoritie from the laws, but laws receive their authoritie from him. We are often indeed minded of what *BRACTON* saies, LEX FACIT REGEM, that the law makes the King; by which that great *Lawyer* was far enough from understanding, that the *King* receives his Soveraign power from the Law; for the law has no authoritie,

nor

nor can give any, but what it receives from the *King*; and then it is a wonderful riddle, how the King ſhould receive his authoritie from the law. But when he ſaies, *The Law makes the King*, he diſtinguiſhes a *King* from a *Tyrant*, and his meaning is, that to Govern by laws, makes a *Soveraign Prince* a *King*, as King ſignifies a Juſt and equal and beneficial power and authoritie; as appears from the reaſon he gives for it, *Non eſt enim Rex, ubi dominatur voluntas, & non lex*; He is no King, who Governs by arbitrarie will, and not by law: not that he is no Soveraign *Prince*, but he is a *Tyrant* and not a *King*.

3. And hence it evidently follows, that the being of Soveraign Power is independent on laws; that is, as a *Soveraign Prince* does not receive his power from the law, ſo, ſhould he violate the laws by which he is bound to Govern, yet he does not forfeit his power. He breaks his faith to God and to his Countrie, but he is a *Soveraign Prince* ſtill. And this is in effect acknowledged by theſe men, who ſo freely confeſs, that let a *Prince* be what he will, though he trample upon all laws, and exerciſe an arbitrarie and illegal authoritie, yet

his perſon is ſacred and inviolable, and irreſiſtible; he muſt not be touch'd nor oppoſed. And allow that ſaying of *David* to be Scripture ſtill, *Who can ſtretch forth his hand againſt the Lord's Anointed, and be guiltleſs?* Now what is it, that makes the perſon of a King more inviolable and unaccountable than other men? Nothing, that I know of, but his ſacred and inviolable authoritie: and therefore it ſeems, though he act againſt law, yet he is a *Soveraign Prince*, and the *Lord's Anointed* ſtill; or elſe I ſee no reaſon, why they might not deſtroy his perſon alſo. And yet if nothing but an inviolable and unaccountable authoritie can make the *Perſon* of the *King* inviolable and unaccountable, I would gladly know, how it becomes lawful to reſiſt his authoritie, and unlawful to reſiſt his Perſon. I would deſire theſe men to tell me, whether a *Soveraign Prince* ſignifies the natural Perſon, or the Authoritie of a King; and if to diveſt him of his authoritie, be to kill the *King*, why they may not kill the man too, when they have killed the *King*. Thus when men are forc't to mince Treaſon and Rebellion, they always ſpeak Nonſenſe. Thoſe indeed who reſiſt the authori-

thoritie of their *Prince*, but ſpare his *Perſon*, do better than thoſe, who kill him; but thoſe who affirm, that his *Perſon* is as reſiſtible and accountable as his *Authoritie*, ſpeak more conſiſtently with themſelves, and the Principles of Rebellion.

4. And hence I ſuppoſe, it plainly appears, that every illegal act the *King* does, is not *an inauthoritative Act*, but laies an obligation on Subjects to yeild, if not an *active*, yet a *paſſive* obedience. For the *King* receives not his Soveraign Authoritie from the Law, nor does he forfeit his authoritie by breaking the law; and therefore he is a *Soveraign Prince* ſtill; and his moſt illegal acts, though they have not the authoritie of the law, yet they have the Authoritie of Soveraign Power, which is irreſiſtible and unaccountable.

In a word, it does not become any man who can think three conſequences off, to talk of the authoritie of laws in derogation to the authoritie of the Soveraign power. The Soveraign power made the laws, and can repeal them and diſpence with them, and make new laws; the onely power and authoritie of the laws is in the power, which

can make and execute Laws. Soveraign Power is inseparable from the Person of a Soveraign Prince: and though the exercise of it may be regulated by Laws, and that Prince does very ill, who having consented to such a regulation, breaks the Laws; yet when he acts contrarie to Law, such acts carrie Soveraign and irresistible Authoritie with them, while he continues a Soveraign *Prince*.

But if it be possible to convince all men how vain this pretence of Laws is, to justifie Resistance or Rebellion against a *Prince*, who persecutes without or against Law, I shall only ask two plain questions.

1. Whether the Laws of God and Nature be not as sacred and inviolable as the Laws of our Country? if they be, (and methinks no man should dare say that they are not) why may we not as well resist a *Prince*, who persecutes us against the Laws of God and Nature, as one, who persecutes against the Laws of our Countrey? is not the Prince as much bound to observe the Laws of God and Nature, as the Laws of his Country? if so, then their distinction between suffering with and against Law

signifies

ſignifies nothing. For all men, who ſuffer for well-doing, ſuffer againſt Law. For by the Laws of God, and the natural ends of humane Government, ſuch men ought to be rewarded, and not puniſht. Nay, they ſuffer contrarie to thoſe Laws, which commanded them to do that good, for which they ſuffer. Thus the Chriſtians ſuffered under *Pagan Emperors*, for worſhipping one ſupreme God, and refuſing to worſhip the numerous *Gods* of the *Heathens*; and therefore, according to theſe principles, might have juſtified a Rebellion againſt thoſe unjuſt and perſecuting powers; but the Apoſtles would not allow this to be a juſt cauſe of reſiſtance, as I have already ſhewn you; and yet I confeſs I am to ſeek for the reaſon of this difference, why we may not reſiſt a *Prince*, who perſecutes againſt the Laws of God, as well as him, who perſecutes againſt the Laws of *England*.

2. My other queſtion is this, Whether a *Prince* have any more authority to make wicked and perſecuting Laws, than to perſecute without Law? Theſe men tell us, that if *Paganiſm* or *Popery* were eſtabliſhed by Law, they were bound to ſuffer patiently for their Religion, without *Julian* Apoſtate

out resistance; but since *Christianity* and *Protestancy* is the Religion of the Nation, they are not bound to suffer, but may defend themselves, when they are condemned by no Law. But if we examine this throughly, it is a very weak and trifling Cavil. For what authoritie has a wicked and persecuting Law? and who gave it this authoritie? what authoritie has any Prince to make Laws against the Laws of God? if he have no authoritie, then it is no Law; and then to make a wicked Law to persecute good men, is the same thing, as to persecute without Law, nay as to persecute against Law. The pretence for resistance is, when the Prince persecutes without authority. Now I say, a *Prince* has no more authoritie to make wicked persecuting Laws, than to persecute without Law. Should a *Popish Prince* procure all our good Laws for the *Protestant Religion* to be repealed, and establish *Popery* by Law, and make it death not to be a *Papist*, he would have no more real authoritie to do this, than to persecute *Protestants* without repealing the Laws. A Soverain and unaccountable power will justifie both, so as to make resistance unlawful; but if it cannot justifie

ſtifie both, it can juſtifie neither. For a *Prince* has no more authoritie to make a bad Law, than to break a good one; ſo that this principle will lead them a great deal farther than they pretend to; and let the *Laws* of the *Land* be what they will, in time they may come to think it a juſt reaſon for Rebellion, to pull down *Antichriſt*, and to ſet up *Chriſt Jeſus* upon this Throne. This I hope is a ſufficient anſwer to the two firſt objections, That we are bound by no Law to ſuffer againſt Law; And that the *Prince* has no authoritie againſt Law.

3. The next objection is, that they have a natural right of *ſelf-preſervation* and *ſelf-defence* againſt unjuſt and illegal violence. This very pretence was made great uſe of to wheadle people into this late Conſpiracie. Thoſe who were employed to prepare and diſpoſe men for *Rebellion*, askt them, whether they would not defend themſelves, if any man came to cut their throats: this they readily ſaid they would: when they had gained this point, they askt them, whether they did not value their Liberties, as much as their Lives; and whether they would not defend them alſo. And thus they might have proceeded to any

part

part of their Liberties, if they had pleaſed; for they have the ſame right to any part, as to the whole, and thus ſelf-defence would at laſt reach to the ſmalleſt occaſion of diſcontent or jealouſie, or diſlike of *Publick Government*.

Now in anſwer to this, I readily grant, that every man has a natural right to preſerve and defend his life by all lawful means; but we muſt not think every thing lawful, which we have ſtrength and power and opportunity to do; and therefore to give a full anſwer to this plea, let us conſider,

1. That ſelf-defence was never allowed by God or Nature againſt publick authority, but only againſt private violence. There was a time, when Fathers had the power of life and death over their own Children; now I would only ask theſe men, whether if a Son at that time ſaw his Father coming to kill him, and that as he thought very unjuſtly, he might kill his Father to defend himſelf. This never was allowed by the moſt barbarous Nations in the world; and yet it may be juſtified by this principle of ſelf-defence, as it is urged by thoſe men; which is a plain argument that it is falſe. It is an expreſs Law, that *he that ſmiteth*

teth his Father or his Mother ſhall be ſurely put to death, 21 *Exod.* 15. and yet then the power of Parents was reſtrained by publick Laws. And the authoritie of a Prince is not leſs ſacred than of a Parent; he's God's Miniſter and Vicegerent, and Subjects are expreſly forbid to reſiſt; and it is a vain thing to pretend a natural right againſt the expreſs Law of God.

2. For the ſole power of the Sword is in the King's hands, and therefore no private man can take the Sword in his own defence but by the King's authoritie, and certainly he cannot be preſumed to give any man authoritie to uſe the Sword againſt himſelf. And therefore as Chriſt tells *Peter*, *he that takes the Sword ſhall periſh by the Sword*; he who draws the Sword againſt the lawful powers, deſerves to die by it.

3. We may conſider alſo, that it is an external Law, that private defence muſt give place to the publick good. Now he that takes Arms to defend his own life and ſome few others, involves a whole Nation in blood and confuſion, and occaſions the miſerable ſlaughter of more men, than a long ſucceſſion of Tyrants could deſtroy. Such men ſacrifice

many

many thousand lives, both of friends and enemies, the happiness and prosperity of many thousand Families, the publick peace and tranquillity of the Nation, to a private self-defence; and if this be the Law of Nature, we may well call Nature a step-mother, that has armed us to our own ruine and confusion.

4. And therefore we may farther observe, that Non-resistance and subjection to government, is the best way for every mans private defence. Our Atheistical Politicians, who know no other Law of nature, but self-defence, make this the Original of humane Societies; That it is a voluntarie combination for self-defence. For this reason they set up Princes and Rulers over them, and put the power of the sword into their hands, that they may administer Justice, and defend their Subjects from publick and private violence: and they are certainly so far in the right, that publick Government is the best securitie not onely of the publick peace, but of every mans private interest; nay it is so, though our Prince be a Tyrant, as I have already shewn you, that no Government can be secure without an irresistible and

un-

unaccountable power. So that the natural right of ſelf-defence is ſo far from juſtifying Rebellion againſt Princes, that it abſolutely condemns it, as deſtructive of the beſt and moſt effectual means to preſerve ourſelves: for though by Non-reſiſtance a man may expoſe his life to the furie of a Tyrant, ſo he may looſe his life in any other way of defence; but publick Government is the beſt and ſureſt defence, and therefore to reſiſt publick Government, is to deſtroy the beſt means of ſelf-defence.

5. However, this principle of ſelf-defence, to be ſure, cannot juſtifie a Rebellion, when men do not ſuffer any actual violence; and therefore thoſe men who were drawn into this late Conſpiracie, when they ſaw no bodie attempt cutting their throats, when they ſaw none of their liberties invaded, were ſo well prepared to be Rebels, that they needed no arguments to perſwade them to it.

4. The next objection againſt the Doctrine of Non-reſiſtance is this, That it deſtroys the difference between an abſolute and limited Monarchy, between a Prince whoſe will is his Law, and a Prince, who is bound to govern by Law; which undermines the Foundamental con-

constitution of the English Government. If this were true, I confess, it were a very hard case for the Ministers of the Church of *England*, who must either preach up resistance, contrarie to the Laws of the Gospel, and the sence and practice of the Christian Church in all Ages, or must preach up Non-resistance, to the destruction of the Government under which they live; but thanks be to God, this is not true. For the difference between an absolute and limited Monarchy, is not, that resistance is unlawful in one case, and lawful in another: for a Monarch, the exercise of whose power is limited and regulated by Laws, is as irresistible, as the most absolute Monarch, whose will is his Law; and if he were not, I would venture to say, that the most absolute and Despotick Government, is more for the publick good, than a limited Monarchy.

But the difference lies in this, that an absolute Monarch is under the Government of no Law, but his own will; he can make and repeal Laws at his pleasure, without asking the consent of any of his Subjects; he can impose what Taxes he pleases, and is not tied up to strict Rules and formalities of Law in

the

the execution of Juſtice; but it is quite contrarie in a limited Monarchy, where the excerciſe of Soveraign Power is regulated by known and ſtanding Laws, which the Prince can neither make nor repeal without the conſent of the people. No man can looſe his Life or Eſtate without a legal proceſs and Tryal; no Monies can be levyed, nor any Taxes impoſed on the Subject, but by Authority of Parliament; which makes the caſe of Subjects differ very much from thoſe, who live under an Arbitrary Prince.

No, you will ſay, the caſe is juſt the ſame: for what do Laws ſignifie, when a Prince muſt not be reſiſted, though he break theſe Laws, and Govern by an Arbitrarie and Lawleſs will? He may make himſelf as abſolute, as the *Great Turk* or the *Mogul*, whenever he pleaſes; for what ſhould hinder him, when all men's hands are tied by this Doctrine of Non-reſiſtance? Now it muſt be acknowledged, that there is a poſſibilitie for ſuch a Prince to Govern arbitrarily, and to trample upon all laws; and yet the difference between an abſolute and limited Monarchy is vaſtly great.

1. For this Prince, though he may make his will a Law to himſelf, and

the onely rule of his Government, yet he cannot make it the Law of the Land; he may break Laws, but he can neither make nor repeal them; and therefore he can never alter the frame and constitution of the Government, though he may at present interrupt the regular administration of it: and this is a great securitie to posteritie, and a present restraint upon himself.

2. For it is a mightie uneasie thing to any Prince, to govern contrarie to known Laws. He offers as great and constant violence to himself, as he does to his Subjects. He cannot raise mony, nor impose any Taxes without the consent of his Subjects, nor take away any man's life without a legal Tryal (which an absolute Prince may do) but he is guiltie of rapine and murder, and feels the same rebukes in his own mind, for such illegal actions, though his impositions be but reasonable and moderate, and he put no man to death, but who very well deserves it, that an *absolute Tyrant* does for the most barbarous oppressions and cruelties. The breach of his Oath to God, and his promises and engagements to his Subjects, makes the exercise of such an arbitrarie power very

trouble-

troubleſome: and though his Subjects are bound not to reſiſt, yet his own guilty fears will not ſuffer him to be ſecure: and arbitrarie Power is not ſo luſcious a thing, as to tempt men to forfeit all the eaſe and pleaſure, and ſecuritie of Government, for the ſake of it.

3. Though Subjects muſt not reſiſt ſuch a *Prince*, who violates the Laws of his Kingdom; yet they are not bound to obey him, nor to ſerve him in his uſurpations. Subjects are bound to obey an *abſolute Monarch*, and to ſerve his will in lawful things, though they be hard and grievous; but in a *limited Monarchy*, which is governed by Laws, Subjects are bound to yeild an active obedience onely according to Law, though they are bound not to reſiſt, when they ſuffer againſt Law. Now it is a mighty uneaſy thing to the greateſt *Tyrant*, to govern always by force; and no Prince in a limited Monarchy can make himſelf abſolute, unleſs his own Subjects aſſiſt him to do ſo.

4. And yet it is very dangerous for any Subject to ſerve his *Prince* contrary to Law. Though the *Prince* himſelf is unaccountable and irreſiſtible, yet his *Miniſters* may be called to an account,

and be punish't for it; and the *Prince* may think fit to look on quietly, and see it done: or if they escape at present, yet it may be time enough to suffer for it under the next *Prince*; which we see by experience makes all men wary how they serve their *Prince* against Law. None but persons of desperate fortunes will do this bare-fac't; and those are not always to be met with, and as seldom fit to be employ'd.

5. And therefore we may observe, that by the fundamental Laws of our Government, as the *Prince* must Govern by Law, so he is irresistible: which shews, that our wise Law-makers did not think, that *Non-resistance* was destructive of a *limited Monarchy*.

6. And in this long succession of *Princes* in this *Kingdom*, there has been no *Prince* that has cast off the Authority of Laws, or usurpt an absolute and arbitrary Power: which shews how vain those fears are, which disturb the fancies and imaginations of Rebels, if they be not pretended onely to disturb the publick Peace.

7. *Non-resistance* is certainly the best way to prevent the change of a *limited* into an *absolute* Monarchy. The Laws of

of *England* have made ſuch an admirable proviſion for the honour and proſperous Government of the Prince, and the ſecurity of the Subject, that the *Kings* of *England* have as little temptation to deſire to be abſolute, while their *Subjects* are obedient and governable, as their Subjects have, that they ſhould be ſo. And if ever *our Kings* attempt to make themſelves abſolute (which thanks be to God, we have no proſpect of yet) it will be owing to the factious and traiterous diſpoſitions of Subjects. When Subjects once learn the trade of murdering Princes, and rebelling againſt them, it is time then for Princes to look to themſelves; and if ever our poſterity ſhould ſuffer under ſo unhappy a change of Government, they will have reaſon for ever to curſe the Fanatick rage and fury of this Age; and the beſt way to remove that ſcandal, which has been already given to Princes, is by a publick profeſſion and practice of this great Goſpel-duty of Non-reſiſtance.

8. The laſt objection againſt Non-reſiſtance is this, that if reſiſtance in no caſe be allowed, the miſchiefs and inconveniences to Mankind may be intolerable. To which I ſhall briefly return theſe following anſwers.

1. That bare Possibilities are no argument against any thing. For that which may be, may not be; and there is nothing in this world, how good or useful or necessary soever it be in its self, but may possibly be attended with very great inconveniences; and if we must reject that which is good and useful in it self, for the sake of some possible inconveniences, which may attend it, we must condemn the very best things. Modesty and Humility, Justice, and Temperance, are great and excellent Vertues; and yet we may live in such an age, when these Vertues shall beggar a man, and expose him to contempt. Mercy and Clemency is a noble quality in a Prince, and yet it is possible, that the Clemency of a Prince may ruine him, and he may spare Traitors Lives, till they take away his. Marriage is a Divine Institution, which contributes as much to the happiness and comfort of humane life, as any one thing in this world; and yet it may be you cannot name any thing neither, which many times proves so great a plague and curse to Mankind. Thus Non-resistance is a great and excellent duty, and absolutely necessary to the peace and order and

good

good government of the world; but yet a bad Prince may take the advantage of it, to do a great deal of miſchief. And what follows from hence? that Non-reſiſtance is no duty, becauſe it may poſſibly be attended with evil conſequences? then you can hardly name any thing, which is our duty; for the moſt excellent Vertues may at one time or other expoſe us to very great inconveniences; but when they do ſo, we muſt not deny them to be our duty, becauſe we ſhall ſuffer by it; but muſt bear our ſufferings patiently, and expect our reward from God. And yet that there is not ſo much danger in Non-reſiſtance, as theſe men would perſwade the world, I hope appears from my anſwers to the laſt objection.

2. When we talk of inconveniences, we muſt weigh the inconveniences on both ſides, and conſider which are greateſt. We may ſuffer great inconveniences by Non-reſiſtance, when our Prince happens to prove a Tyrant; but ſhall we ſuffer fewer inconveniences were it lawful for Subjects to reſiſt?

Which is the greateſt and moſt mercileſs Tyrant? an arbitrary and lawleſs Prince, or a Civil War; which will de-

stroy most mens Lives? a *Nero* or *Dioclesian*, or a pitcht Battel? who will devour most Estates? a Covetous and Rapacious Prince, or an insolent Army, and hungry Rabble? which is the greatest oppression of the Subject? some illegal Taxes, or Plunderings, Decimations, and Sequestrations?

Who are most likely to abuse their power? the Prince, or the people? which is most probable, that a Prince should oppress his dutiful and obedient Subjects, or that some factious and designing men should misrepresent the government of their Prince, and that the giddy multitude should believe them? who is most likely to make a change and alteration in government? an Hereditary Prince, or the People, who are fond of innovations?

While Soverain and irresistible power is in the hands of the Prince, it is possible we may sometimes have a good one, and then we shall find no inconvenience in the Doctrine of Non-resistance. Nay, it is possible, we may have a great many good Princes, for one bad one; for Monsters are not so common, as more natural productions: so that the inconveniences we may suffer by this Doctrine

ſtrike with but ſeldom happen; but had the people power to reſiſt, it is almoſt impoſſible, that publick government ſhould ever be quiet and ſecure for half an age together: they are as unſtable as the Seas, and as eaſily moved with every breath, and as outragious and tempeſtuous too. Theſe are not ſome gueſſes and probabilities, but demonſtrations in this unhappy age, wherein we have ſeen all theſe things acted.

The

The CONCLUSION,

Containing a short Dissuasive from Resistance and Rebellion.

HAving thus largely proved that Subjection and Non-resistance is a necessary duty, which Subjects owe to Soverain Princes, and answered all those objections which are made against it; the result of all is, to perswade Subjects to the practise of it. And St. *Paul* urges two very powerful arguments to perswade us to it, *Rom.* 13.

1. That *the powers are of God, and he that resisteth the powers, resisteth the ordinance of God.* And certainly he is no Christian who disputes obedience to the Divine Ordinance and Constitution. A Prince is the Image, the Vice-gerent of God, and therefore Princes are called *Gods* in Scripture, and be he what he will, a good or a bad Prince, while God thinks fit to advance him to the Throne, it becomes us to submit and reverence the Divine Authority. Will you

you lift up your hand againſt God? will you caſt off his authority and government too? does not he know how to rule us? how to chuſe a Prince for us? The greateſt Rebel would bluſh to ſay this in ſo many words, and yet this is the Language of Rebellion. Men diſlike their Prince, that is, that Governour, whom God ſets over them: they rebel againſt their Prince, they Depoſe him, they Murder him; that is, they diſown the Authority of God, they deface and deſtroy his Image, and offer ſcorn and contempt to his Vice gerent. Earthly Princes look upon every affront and diſgrace done to their Miniſters and Lieutenants, to be a contempt of their own Authority; and ſo does God too: he who pulls down a Prince, denies Gods authority to ſet him up, and affronts his wiſdom in chuſing him.

2. And therefore ſuch men muſt not expect to eſcape a deſerved puniſhment, *they ſhall receive to themſelves damnation.* Now κρίμα may either ſignifie the puniſhment of Rebellion in this world, or in the next; and here it ſignifies both.

1. They ſhall be puniſht in this world. And whoever conſults Ancient and Modern

der Hiſtories, will find, that Rebels very ſeldom eſcape puniſhment in this world. How often does God defeat all their Counſels, diſcover their ſecret Plots and Conſpiracies! and if they be proſperous for a while, yet vengeance overtakes them; if they eſcape puniſhment from men, they are puniſht by ſome ſuch remarkable providence, as bears the Characters of a Divine Juſtice in it.

2. However, ſuch men ſhall not eſcape the puniſhments of the other world; and if you believe there is a Hell for Rebels and Traitors, the puniſhment of reſiſtance is infinitely greater than all the miſchiefs which can befal you in ſubjection to Princes, and a patient ſuffering for well doing. *What ſhall it profit a man, though he ſhould gain the whole world*, which is ſomething more than a ſingle Crown and Kingdom, *and looſe his own Soul?* Though an univerſal Empire were the reward of Rebellion, ſuch a glorious Traitor, who parts with his Soul for it, would have no great reaſon to boaſt much of his purchaſe. Let us then reverence the Divine Judgments, let us patiently ſubmit to our King, though he ſhould perſecute and oppreſs us; and expect our protection here from the

the Divine Providence, and our reward in Heaven; which is the ſame encouragement to Non-reſiſtance, which we have to the practiſe of any other Vertue. Were the advantages and diſadvantages of Reſiſtance and Non-reſiſtance in this world fairly eſtimated, it were much more eligible to ſubmit, than to rebel againſt our Prince; but there can be no compariſon between theſe two, when we take the other world into the account. The laſt Judgment weighs down all other conſiderations; and certainly Rebellion may well be ſaid to be as the ſin of Witchcraft, when it ſo inchants men, that they are reſolved to be Rebels, though they be damned for it.

THE END.

BOOKS Printed for *Fincham Gardiner.*

1. A Perſwaſive to Communion with the Church of *England.*

2. A Reſolution of ſome Caſes of Conſcience which reſpect Church-Communion.

3. The Caſe of Indifferent things uſed in the Worſhip of God, propoſed and ſtated, by conſidering theſe Queſtions, &c.

4. A Diſcourſe about Edification.

5. The Reſolution of this Caſe of Conſcience, *Whether the Church of* Englands *Symbolizing ſo far as it doth with the Church of* Rome, *makes it unlawful to hold Communion with the Church of* England?

6. A Letter to *Anonymus*, in anſwer to his three Letters to Dr. *Sherlock* about Church-Communion.

7. Certain Caſes of Conſcience reſolved, concerning the Lawfulneſs of joyning with Forms of Prayer in Publick Worſhip. In two Parts.

8. The Caſe of mixt Communion: Whether it be Lawful to Separate from

a Church upon the account of promiscuous Congregations and mixt Communions?

9. An Answer to the Dissenters Objections against the Common Prayers, and some other parts of Divine Service prescribed in the Liturgy of the Church of *England*.

10. The Case of Kneeling at the Holy Sacrament stated and resolved, &c. In two Parts.

11. A Discourse of Profiting by Sermons, and of going to hear where men think they can profit most.

12. A serious Exhortation, with some important Advices, relating to the late Cases about Conformity, recommended to the present Dissenters from the Church of *England*.

13. An Argument for Union, taken from the true interest of those Dissenters in *England* who profess and call themselves Protestants.

14. Some Considerations about the Case of Scandal, or giving Offence to Weak Brethren.

15. The Case of Infant-Baptism, in Five Questions, &c.

16. The Charge of Scandal, and giving Offence by Conformity, Refelled, and

and Reflected back upon Separation, *&c.*

1. A Discourse about the charge of Novelty upon the Reformed Church of *England*, made by the Papists asking of us the Question, Where was our Religion before *Luther*?

2. A Discourse about Tradition, shewing what is meant by it, and what Tradition is to be received, and what Tradition is to be rejected.

3. The difference of the Case between the Separation of Protestants from the Church of *Rome*, and the Separation of Dissenters from the Church of *England*.

4. The Protestant Resolution of Faith, *&c.*

Some Seasonable Reflections on the Discovery of the late Plot, being a Sermon preached on that occasion, by *W. Sherlock*, D. D. Rector of St. *George Buttolph-lane*, *London*.

King *David's* Deliverance: or, the Conspiracy of *Absolon* and *Achitophel* defeated, in a Sermon Preached on the day of Thanksgiving appointed for the Discovery of the late Fanatical Plot. By *Thomas Long*, B. D. one of the Prebendaries of *Exon*.